DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 959 HE 030 178

AUTHOR	Anderson, Erin, Ed.
TITLE	Campus Use of the Teaching Portfolio: Twenty-Five Profiles. AAHE Teaching Initiative.
INSTITUTION	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	128p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110 ($13 members, $15 nonmembers).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; *College Faculty; *Employment Practices; Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; *Personnel Policy; *Portfolio Assessment; Portfolios (Background Materials); Profiles; Program Descriptions; Program Design

ABSTRACT

Twenty-five profiles of college and university programs using teaching portfolios to evaluate faculty are presented to illustrate how portfolio use relates to institutional context and purposes of evaluation. An introductory section makes observations about the profiles in general and highlights some issues emerging during preparation of the profiles. Programs represented include those of: Ball State University (Indiana); City University of New York, York College; Dalhousie University (Nova Scotia, Canada); Doane College (Nebraska); The Evergreen State College (Washington); Fayetteville State University (North Carolina); Gordon College (Massachusetts); Harvard University Medical School (Massachusetts); Manhattanville College (New York); Miami-Dade Community College (Florida); Murray State University (Kentucky); Otterbein College (Ohio); Saint Norbert College (Wisconsin); San Diego State University (California); Syracuse University (New York); Texas A & M University; Tompkins Cortland Community College (New York); University of Colorado at Boulder; University of Maryland University College; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Pittsburgh, Greensburg Campus (Pennsylvania); University of Wisconsin, La Crosse; Western Michigan University; and York University (Ontario, Canada). The charter document for the Syracuse University program is appended. Contains 13 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 406 959

THE TEACHING INITIATIVE

Campus Use of the Teaching Portfolio

Twenty-Five Profiles

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

NE 030 178

AAHE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Campus Use of the Teaching Portfolio

Twenty-Five Profiles

With an Introduction by Pat Hutchings

edited by Erin Anderson

A publication of
The AAHE Teaching Initiative
American Association for Higher Education

Special thanks

Special thanks to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) for supporting this publication through AAHE's Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards (for more on the Forum, see p. 122).

CAMPUS USE OF THE TEACHING PORTFOLIO: 25 PROFILES
With an Introduction by Pat Hutchings
edited by Erin Anderson

© 1993 by the American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

A publication of the AAHE Teaching Initiative. For more about AAHE and the Teaching Initiative, see page 121.

Additional copies of this publication are available for $13.00 each for AAHE members; $15.00 each for nonmembers. Bulk discounts and express delivery are available. Order from:
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
202-293-6440, fax 202-293-0073

CONTENTS

PREFACE v

INTRODUCTION 1
by Pat Hutchings

CAMPUS PROFILES

Ball State University 8
CUNY York College 10
Dalhousie University 16
Doane College 19
The Evergreen State College 23
Fayetteville State University 29
Gordon College 31
Harvard University Medical School 33
Manhattanville College 35
Miami-Dade Community College 37
Murray State University 42
Otterbein College 44
Saint Norbert College 46
San Diego State University 50
Syracuse University 55
Texas A&M University 58
Tompkins Cortland Community College 60
University of Colorado at Boulder 67
University of Maryland University College 70
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities 74
University of Nebraska-Lincoln 76
University of Pittsburgh, Greensburg Campus 81
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse 88
Western Michigan University 97
York University 102

BIBLIOGRAPHY 105

APPENDIX

Syracuse University's "Charter" 107
About AAHE 121

PREFACE

This volume represents a kind of natural history of the teaching portfolio. Our intent is not to present the best of current practice (though lots of positive examples can be gleaned from the profiles that follow); nor is it to provide a comprehensive survey or scientific sample of the field (though we've tried to represent a range of approaches in a range of settings). Instead, our first interest has been to demonstrate how portfolio use depends on context and purpose, and we've selected examples that make that point.

But another principle of selection has been institutional candor and a willingness to share unfinished work. We're grateful to the faculty and administrators who spent time helping us get their stories as right as we could in several pages, who made documents and materials available, and who generously offered to let readers contact them for more information.

Special recognition also should go to my colleague Erin Anderson, project assistant for the AAHE Teaching Initiative, who surveyed campuses, checked facts, wrote and rewrote, and negotiated ways to "get it right" while constantly needing to limit and focus. Erin and I both thank Bry Pollack and Gail Hubbard for editorial assistance and for seeing this volume through to final copy.

Finally, it is appropriate to connect this publication of the Teaching Initiative with another, newer AAHE program, the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards. A three-year project, supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), the Forum sponsors a national conference and develops tools and resources to help campuses rethink the character of faculty work, its evaluation, and reward. The teaching portfolio is highly relevant to the Forum's agenda, and we thank FIPSE for underwriting this collection of campus profiles of portfolio use.

Pat Hutchings
Director, AAHE Teaching Initiative
March 1993

INTRODUCTION

By Pat Hutchings
Director, AAHE Teaching Initiative

In the fall of 1991, AAHE published a monograph on the teaching portfolio. In it, Russ Edgerton, Kathleen Quinlan, and I made an argument for using portfolios to "uncover the scholarship of teaching," proposed a model for doing so and steps for implementing it, and set forth eight sample entries. That monograph has proved the most popular item AAHE has published in recent years — testimony to the widespread interest in teaching portfolios and a growing demand for information about them.

It is this demand for information about portfolios that persuaded us to undertake a second publication on the topic, a sort of companion piece to the first, attempting to provide what people everywhere I go are asking for: accounts of actual campus experience. "How do we know these things will make a difference?" campuses ask. "Are there any biology departments using them?" a biologist wants to know. "What happens when the president mandates portfolio use?" faculty inquire. And, often a question posed with furrowed brow, "What criteria are used to evaluate them?"

The profiles of campus practice compiled in this volume attempt to answer questions such as these by providing detailed but concise accounts of what twenty-five campuses are doing with and learning about portfolios. Each profile addresses a set of common questions: What goes into portfolios? How are they evaluated? and so on. And because the story is an evolving one, each names a campus person or people you can contact for further information. Accompanying some profiles, you'll also find materials that campuses have developed, such as guidelines for developing a portfolio and checklists for evaluating them.

One aim in compiling these profiles and materials, then, is to capture the stories of individual campuses. But we're also interested in looking across the diverse settings and practices set forth here to identify broader issues and lessons. No doubt, you'll do your own analysis toward that end. But in the spirit of an introduction (and having talked extensively with and visited a good number of the institutions represented here), I would like to set forth nine points that particularly strike me. Some are good news, some not so good; most are suggestive, I think, when it comes to deciding where to put one's energies and what next steps are most worth taking.

(1) A first thing to note — and an important point to put at the top of the list — is that the *what* and *how* of teaching portfolios tell only the surface of the story, which is often much better understood in terms of *why* and *where*. That is, decisions about whether portfolios should require syllabi, for instance, or whether they should be seventeen pages or

seventy, are only the tip of the iceberg. The deeper challenges are those of mission and values: How much *does* teaching matter on our campus? What *kind* of teaching do we most value — and (the necessary corollary here) what kind of *learning*? What are faculty expected to know and be able to do as teachers, and what institutional resources are committed to their professional development? These are important questions that campuses often haven't asked in a thorough way; teaching portfolios can put such questions in the air.

The teaching portfolio "movement" is, in this, a lot like the student assessment movement. What's important is not so much the approach that's chosen as the power of the tool itself to raise questions about mission and values, and to force greater degrees of collective self-consciousness about purposes and their achievement. Like assessment, portfolios thrive in a context of clear values behind their use. This point is especially relevant to and reflected in comments about obstacles and impact in the profiles that follow, where, it seems to me, "success" has a lot less to do with mechanics than with attention to campus culture, consistency of signals, leadership from the top, and clarity of purpose. Indeed, with these things attended to, the "how-to" questions almost take care of themselves.

(2) Conventional wisdom has it that evaluation and improvement make poor bedfellows, but accounts of campus use of portfolios suggest a more complicated relationship between the two — a relationship that portfolios might help us rethink.

One thing I noted, looking at the profiles included in this volume, is that many campuses turn to portfolios initially with issues of rewards in mind; by putting more substantive, compelling evidence of teaching on the table, the argument goes, portfolios can help "tip" the reward system, or at least align it more completely with the value people place on teaching. Reports from some of the campuses represented here suggest that such effects are beginning to be evident. The University of Nebraska points to data showing that faculty believe teaching is being taken more seriously. When faculty at CUNY York College are asked about their experience with portfolios (which became part of the personnel decision process in the fall of 1992), many are quick to attribute a recent promotion or tenure decision to the chance provided by the portfolio "to make a case for myself," "to really represent the work I do with students."

But what one also sees in the stories here is that purposes begin to shift and broaden as faculty experience the power of portfolios to prompt personal growth and improvement. The same CUNY York College faculty member who was glowing over a promotion added, ". . . but that's not the only reason to do portfolios. They also foster reflection and improvement." An interesting case in point is the Gordon College experience. Having used portfolios for personnel decision making for a number of years, the campus has more recently revamped their use to take advantage of the portfolio's professional-development potential for both junior and experienced faculty. A similar "change in direction" is under way at Ball State University, where a next stage of work emphasizes the "faculty development" aspects of portfolio use.

I was recently part of a campus discussion where a faculty member noted the need to choose between evaluation and improvement purposes as the institution moved into portfolio use. "But why can't we have it both ways?" another asked. A good number of the profiles included here are stories about having it both ways, about inventing a mechanism and processes that may blur the line between what's good for improvement and what's useful for evaluation. It is relevant to note, for instance, a move toward more-frequent evaluation of teaching, not only at the obvious high-stakes points of promotion and tenure but at pre- and post-tenure points

as well. And, one can imagine (and *begin* to see in some of the profiles here) a kind of ongoing evaluation in which faculty are much more agents than objects; where substantive evidence is put forward for discussion; where the culture is such that people have habits of talking about and inquiring into teaching; and where improvement is not simply a matter of learning new methods but of being part of a culture that takes teaching seriously, thinks of it as a public act and an appropriate activity for collective attention and review.

In the meantime, having seen the benefits of portfolios for improvement, some faculty are now talking (though not in the reports included here) about two portfolios: one, a larger, personal collection of documents and journals and reflections kept over time and used for reflection; the other a more selective (and compact) version that could go forward in personnel decisions. That's one answer to the question: How can we have it both ways?

(3) Another key to having it both ways might lie in a lesson evident in almost all of the profiles about the value of *process*. The most common theme I hear as I talk to faculty using portfolios is that the act of developing them is "a learning experience." A professor at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse describes his portfolio-development process as "the single most interesting and valuable course-revision activity in my twelve years of teaching at this institution." A faculty member at CUNY York College told me it was "a wonderful chance to put all the pieces together," to look at professional development as a whole and to see "what it adds up to." The experience of a faculty member reported in the Texas A&M profile captures the power of a process that virtually forces reflection: "I never realized why I do [a particular activity] in my classroom until I did the portfolio."

Interestingly, the portfolio process can be equally valuable on the other end — that is, at points where portfolios are read, reviewed, and judged by others. It has become a truism of portfolio use that putting them together is easier than knowing "what to do with them once you've got them." But the stories in this volume, and the accounts from campuses I've visited, do not bear out that observation. Even in the apparently most problematic contexts — where portfolios are being used to determine tenure and promotion by committees having little experience with them — judgments have indeed been arrived at, committees have stood behind those decisions, faculty have not flocked to grieve the process. In fact, several campuses report that the process of reading and reviewing portfolios has turned out to be illuminating and significant for those engaged in it. I hear chairs talking about a better understanding of teaching and learning in their departments as a result of reading portfolios. I hear people rethinking the protocol for promotion and tenure deliberation, asking whether the allotted time is sufficient, whether feedback to peers ought not to be improved, and so forth. And on some campuses (see the report from the University of Maryland University College, for instance), the process of reviewing portfolios has prompted a desire to specify "criteria of excellence" by which to judge faculty performance, plus a new interest in discussing and clarifying standards.

(4) Some of the value of the portfolio-development process presumably would be realized even if it were conducted in one's office with the door closed. But too much of the work of teaching goes on behind closed doors. Not surprisingly, one of the aspects of portfolio use that most excites faculty is the prospect of being much more public about their teaching. I was recently at a workshop at a campus in the University of Wisconsin system where, following my description of how portfolios might look and work, a faculty member noted, "We do something

a lot like that already in our evaluation of teaching. But what we don't do is ever to *look at* each other's materials, which are private and confidential. Doing so would be a real benefit." I like the way Tompkins Cortland Community College puts the point: There, the aim of portfolios is to "structure conversation" about teaching.

An intent to use portfolios to make teaching more public is in every way admirable, and a good number of campuses find it a key to implementation, as well. They begin by recruiting a group of respected faculty to develop portfolio entries that can be shared with colleagues. In such scenarios, a highly engaging discussion ensues, and the discussion is not about portfolios *per se* but about the teaching represented in the entry. (The La Crosse profile cites this phenomenon, but I've seen it over and over.) This point is worth noting in terms of not only "change strategies" but purposes: What we're after ultimately is not, after all, a better tool for documenting teaching but better teaching!

More immediately, however, the power of portfolios to open the classroom door calls for further thinking about how to tap that power, and the campus reports here provide suggestive answers. Following the lead of several campuses featured in this volume, one might ask certain faculty members to share entries-in-progress with one another and a larger circle of colleagues. Later in the process, finished portfolios might be put on display, as they have been at York College, in a faculty resource center. Or, one might take a cue from Western Michigan University, which goes yet a step further. There, portfolios developed by teaching assistants in the writing program are kept in a public place in the English department; TAs are encouraged to look through one another's portfolios, borrow ideas, and leave notes of response and commentary.

(5) The prospect of making teaching more public points up what is, to my mind, one of the chief contributions portfolios may be able to make: that of nudging us toward the peer review of teaching.

Peer review matters, as AAHE President Russ Edgerton has argued, because it's a mark of value in academe: Research is peer reviewed, and so too should teaching be if it is to rival research in status and reward. That said, it also needs to be said that peer review is a term that prompts considerable squirming and discomfort by faculty, many of whom envision drop-in classroom visits by an (inevitably antagonistic) colleague. What's needed, and what portfolios may help foster, is a broader, more useful conception of peer review — not as perfunctory classroom visits but as a matter of professional accountability among faculty, and as a range of activities through which faculty themselves assume responsibility for monitoring and improving the quality of teaching.

It's notable, in this regard, that the immediate impetus for portfolios in a number of places derives from dissatisfaction with exclusive reliance on student ratings as evidence of teaching effectiveness. That's where Murray State started; it's what got early attention at the University of Nebraska. At a minimum, moving beyond student ratings is a step toward sounder evaluation practice through the principle of multiple sources of evidence. But it also can be seen as a step toward an important kind of peer review. For instance, at the University of Pittsburgh, Greensburg Campus, teaching portfolios are part of a larger initiative to institute peer review. And Otterbein College's education department notes that its use of portfolios is part of an effort to prompt more and better discussion of teaching (including midsemester, portfolio-based review sessions between faculty and the chair), greater collaboration, and more visits to one another's classes.

(6) Portfolios may be a route to peer review, but only if we can use them to document aspects of teaching that *warrant* that collegial process of judgment. This was the thrust of the subtitle of AAHE's earlier monograph, *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching.* But now, after a year and a half of intervening practice, clearly it is quite possible to "do portfolios" that *don't* reveal much "scholarship in teaching," but are simply expanded resumes. One reason, I think, is that though many of us have been attracted to the notion of teaching as a scholarly activity, there has been little progress so far in agreeing on what that might mean, in generating images of scholarly teaching. Another reason — particularly relevant to this volume — is that we need models of the teaching portfolio that would document the more substantive, intellectual (i.e., scholarly) aspects of teaching.

As I have listened to faculty talk about portfolios, I've come to believe that particularly promising models might be driven by Donald Schön's notion of reflective practice *(The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action,* 1983). Those models would begin with a conception of teaching itself as a complex, highly situated, problem-solving activity . . . from which it would follow that a portfolio entry representing "best work" (something the earlier AAHE monograph argues for) would not be one in which all the loose ends had been neatly tucked in. Rather, "best work" would be the most reflective work, and portfolio entries would show a teacher in the process of making sense of, diagnosing, inquiring into, and actively experimenting with the toughest aspects of his or her practice; "best work" entries would make *visible* the problematic dimensions of teaching, rather than conceal them.

It is that kind of entry I hear faculty get most excited about. Some of the best examples along those lines can be found in portfolios being developed by TAs in writing programs (several are featured here). Also highly suggestive is William Cerbin's prototype for a "course portfolio" described and excerpted in the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse profile.

(7) A related point is this: Currently, less attention than one might hope is focused on the relationship between portfolio use and an image of effective teaching. With respect to the "what's in 'em?" question, for instance, on many campuses the answer is framed in terms of categories of evidence — what I've come to call the "partridge-in-a-pear-tree portfolio," with one syllabus, two student papers, three letters from alums, and so forth. In fact, that is not at all a bad way to start — it's modest and feasible — but certainly it is not where one would hope to end. What is wanted in the longer term are portfolios that reflect some campus or departmental agreement (no doubt evolving and always under discussion) about what effective teachers know and can do.

Happily, this volume includes a number of examples of such portfolios. Western Michigan University and Otterbein College both expect portfolio entries to reflect agreed-upon program goals. The University of Colorado is attempting to identify key tasks of teaching in order to structure portfolios around them; Manhattanville College has a FIPSE project under way to turn the fuzzy criterion of "excellence" (by which portfolios are currently evaluated) into a clearer set of expectations. Among its expected entries, York College specifies one that speaks to the relationship between the faculty member's own teaching goals and practices and the publicly articulated mission of the department and college (this entry to be negotiated with department chairs).

(8) Most of the work represented in the campus profiles that follow is appropriately called by the name "teaching portfolio." But a number of campuses have moved to (or, in some cases, have begun with) a kind of portfolio that documents not only teaching but a more integrated vision of faculty's scholarly work. Examples included here are Fayetteville State University; CUNY York College; and the University of Pittsburgh, Greensburg Campus.

The downside of this broader reach may be monster portfolios that try to do everything and do nothing well. But the upside is that such portfolios might be used to explore and deconstruct the old categories. Imagine, for instance, a portfolio with five or seven entries documenting work that blurs the line between teaching and service (e.g., giving a lecture in one's field for a community group) or between research and teaching (e.g., collaborating with undergraduates to publish a paper). Such portfolios might move us toward realizing the more integrated, holistic view of faculty work called for by Ernest Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered*.

(9) It seems right to end this list of observations with a point about what is rightly the bottom line: student learning. As I look at current uses of teaching portfolios, what heartens me more than anything is a recognition that they need to be teaching *and learning* portfolios; most of the campuses featured here require or urge portfolio entries focused on student learning. Maybe the premise of the student assessment movement has finally begun to sink in — that the point of teaching is learning; and that we need to ask, on a regular, ongoing basis, whether students are learning what we think we're teaching.

The portfolio is a wonderful place to ask that question — and a good place, too, to acknowledge that the answer is often not a simple "yes" or "no" but a more ambiguous "maybe," "sort of," "for some students," "on some days." . . . Good teaching entails ongoing inquiry into and reflection on its connection to learning; the most powerful teaching portfolios will make that inquiry public and help get into our collective heads that learning is what matters most.

25 PROFILES OF CAMPUS PRACTICE

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

The Institution

Ball State University is located in Muncie, Indiana. Originally established as the Indiana State Normal School, Ball State now offers associate, baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degrees in the liberal arts, teacher education, and professional areas. Student enrollment is 21,000; total instructional faculty number almost 1,000.

Background

Ball State has always valued good teaching, and the teaching portfolio is seen as a way to enact that value more thoroughly by promoting both the improvement of teaching and its clearer documentation. A growing number of Ball State faculty have developed portfolios over the past several years as part of a faculty-driven program; a good number of faculty also have submitted their portfolios (though not necessarily calling them that) for personnel decisions, which, in most cases, now require multiple sources of evidence. The future of the teaching portfolio at Ball State emphasizes its strength as a faculty-development tool — a change in direction for the program in response to feedback from those faculty who have already developed portfolios.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

The Teaching Portfolio Project, including workshops, information, and assistance, is a faculty-driven program operating under the direction of the Center for Teaching and Learning. More than 200 faculty have attended workshops on portfolio development and use — some conducted by Pace University professor Peter Seldin, most by Ball State faculty who have themselves become experienced with portfolios. (Exactly how many faculty actually are developing portfolios is hard to know, since it is not a mandated program.) Workshop participants represent a broad cross-section of the university faculty. The School of Music is strongly urging faculty, particularly junior faculty, to submit teaching portfolios.

Portfolio Design and Contents

There are no standard guidelines. Portfolio contents are dictated by individual needs. Suggested items include a statement of teaching philosophy, including goals, objectives, and methods; self-evaluation of teaching methods; syllabi; teaching grants/awards; student and peer evaluations; and course and course software development and innovations. For faculty-development purposes (the current emphasis of the program), analysis of methods and objectives is stressed.

Evaluation of Portfolios

Considerable discussion surrounds the use of teaching portfolios for personnel decisions, with a number of issues of portfolio evaluation yet to be resolved. For instance, promotion and tenure committee members both at the departmental and college levels (especially those who have not created a teaching portfolio themselves) question whether there is a difference between a portfolio that reflects good teaching and one that is well written. Slow inroads are anticipated in this area. Yet, the actual use of portfolios has begun to resolve other issues related to personnel decisions. First, the teaching portfolio suggests ways to present teaching accomplishments within

the framework required by various committees. Second, since the foremost result of developing a portfolio is improved teaching, a more positive tenure and promotion review naturally follows.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

Although there is some administrative concern about the applicability of the teaching portfolio to personnel decisions, administrators and faculty alike see the value of the teaching portfolio as a teaching-improvement tool. The greatest obstacle with regard to faculty development is providing initial training and guidance to a large number of faculty, especially to the tenured and tenure-track members. Second, since the institution is so large and the project is faculty-driven, it is difficult to get detailed feedback on what people are doing with their portfolios.

Impact

When used for teaching-improvement purposes, portfolios have had impressive results: Faculty report improved teaching and course design, and renewed enthusiasm. Portfolio workshops have "re-energized" some faculty. Many report that the process of compiling a portfolio is beneficial to thinking about teaching.

As yet, there has been no clearly discernible impact on tenure and promotion, aside from those developments suggested above. While the institution places strong emphasis on teaching, evaluation procedures and criteria for the teaching portfolio remain a problem.

Next Steps

Increasingly greater weight is being placed on the portfolio's use as a faculty-development tool. With this purpose in mind, the program is shifting emphasis from teaching portfolio workshops to individualized one-on-one consulting, coordinated by the Center for Teaching and Learning in conjunction with other faculty-development programs offered through the Center.

Meanwhile, resources are not available to maintain regular contact with those faculty who have already developed teaching portfolios through workshops or otherwise. Emphasis at this stage is on encouraging the remainder of the tenured and tenure-track faculty to develop teaching portfolios as part of a faculty-development program.

A new direction for teaching portfolios may be suggested by the work of Leo Hodlofski, one of Ball State's faculty consultants, who has converted his teaching portfolio into an "electronic portfolio." Discrete files on each content area are maintained on computer, and portions are "drawn down" as they are deemed useful for promotion and tenure, merit decisions, grants, vitae, etc. Physical documentation is maintained in parallel files.

Contacts: Mark Fissel
Director, Center for Teaching and Learning
and
Leo Hodlofski
Assistant Professor of Classics
and
Anthony Edmonds
Professor of History
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306

CUNY YORK COLLEGE

The Institution

York College is one of the senior colleges of the City University of New York (CUNY) system. Located in Jamaica, New York, on Long Island, York serves a diverse student population of approximately 6,600; students pursue four- and five-year baccalaureate degrees. York has 155 full-time faculty.

Background

While teaching has always been central to the mission of York College, some faculty have felt that it has not been systematically evaluated. In an attempt to make evaluation more evidence-based and improvement-oriented, York's newly inaugurated president mandated in March 1992 that all faculty applying for promotion and tenure submit "professional portfolios" documenting their scholarship in all areas, including — and especially — teaching. That mandate was followed by a series of workshops and faculty discussions to explore the idea and develop a model appropriate to York College.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Since then, a pilot group of twenty-five faculty volunteers have developed portfolios, and a first round of personnel and budget hearings to which portfolios were submitted was completed in October 1992. By the fall of 1993, all candidates for promotion and tenure must have a portfolio.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Portfolio guidelines were generated in the spring of 1992 by faculty who were developing pilot portfolios; the central principle of their model was intentionally "minimalist," with the idea that "less is more" until proven otherwise, at which point the guidelines will be revised. The current model calls for the following entries: (1) a "framing statement," indicating the individual's teaching roles and responsibilities as assigned and agreed to by the department and/or institution; (2) a personal, reflective/philosophical statement; (3) two entries built around a work sample (e.g., syllabus, student paper, handouts), accompanied by reflective commentary explaining the thinking behind the work sample (entries modeled on examples in AAHE's *The Teaching Portfolio)*; (4) two entries that provide evidence from others (e.g., student ratings, letters from students, peer visitation reports); (5) an enhanced curriculum vita accompanied by a brief explanation of each item listed; (6) a letter to the reader that provides guidance regarding entries and how to read them, if appropriate.

Five faculty from a variety of disciplines developed an entry of each type; these sample entries, which they shared with colleagues in a summer workshop, were essential in helping faculty visualize what was expected and move ahead in completing their own portfolios. Further experience also has suggested that the "framing statement" entry is particularly useful both to the individual developing the portfolio and to its readers/reviewers.

Evaluation of Portfolios

Portfolios were first used in promotion and tenure decisions in October 1992, when twenty-five faculty submitted portfolios as part of their personnel files. Portfolios were evaluated according to the same criteria used throughout the CUNY system, which are mandated by the collective bargaining unit. While portfolios did not ensure a positive action by the review committee, many of the faculty who submitted portfolios felt the portfolios were a better way of "making a case" for themselves. While some members of the Personnel and Budget Committee felt that certain portfolios were "padded," most members seemed to enjoy reading them and found that portfolios gave "a better picture" of faculty performance.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

A first obstacle was that faculty who volunteered to develop portfolios for the fall of 1992 found it difficult to proceed without seeing actual examples. Given that such examples were hard to come by (portfolios available from other institutions were not necessarily relevant to York's context and purposes), York developed its own examples. Five lead faculty developed sample entries, which then were made available to all other interested faculty. In keeping with this spirit of openness, the larger collection of completed portfolios was displayed at a January 1993 faculty-staff conference. The collection also will remain on loan for viewing and study throughout the semester.

A second obstacle entailed the evaluation of portfolios. Many faculty supported the use of portfolios, seeing in them a way to give their contributions as teachers more visibility and weight in personnel decisions, but department chairs faced with evaluating the portfolios were more skeptical. Concerns included issues of fairness, possible violations of collective bargaining rules, and the time it would take to read them. Consultation with a department chair from another institution using portfolios helped to allay these concerns, but most important was the actual experience of evaluating portfolios, which proceeded more or less smoothly.

Materials Attached or Available

- President Josephine Davis's memo to the faculty, announcing the new portfolio requirement, is attached, as are the "Proposed Guidelines for Content of Portfolios at York College."

Contact: Daisy Cocco De Filippis
Academic Dean
York College
The City University of New York
94-20 Guy Brewer Boulevard
Jamaica, NY 11451

AS DISCUSSED

YORK COLLEGE
The City University of New York

MEMORANDUM

From the Office of the President

TO: York College P & B

DATE: March 31, 1992

FROM: President Josephine D. Davis

SUBJECT: **Portfolio Implementation**

DEFINITION:

AS PRODUCT

Faculty Portfolio - A comprehensive presentation of the works, activities and achievements of faculty in the primary areas of the academy - teaching, scholarly activities and service. A holistic portrayal of a person's professional capabilities.

AS PROCESS

Faculty Portfolio - A dynamic process which, at the institutional level, opens campus dialogue on academic excellence and which, at the individual level, engages one in a process of self analysis and critique. Evolutionary. A prototypical process which measures the degree of articulation between one's scholarly and professional goal statements and their attainment.

IMPLEMENTATION:

WHO AND WHEN?

The portfolio approach to faculty evaluation shall be implemented on a voluntary basis for continuing faculty through the 1992 Fall Semester. Afterwards, it shall be the standard used for all faculty evaluations. Beginning the 1992 Fall Semester new faculty reviewed for reappointment shall use the portfolio approach.

WHAT AND WHERE?

At York College the faculty portfolio shall have three component parts - Teaching, Scholarly Activities and Service. The Department Chairs shall have primary responsibility for assisting faculty with their portfolio development. Support shall also be provided by senior faculty within the department. The faculty development center shall serve as a secondary resource for faculty portfolio development.

Portfolio Page 2

ORGANIZATION OF THE PORTFOLIO

CRITERIA

Section I. Goal Statement - The aim to which a person is directing his/her scholarly achievements. A description of how one's professional goals relate to the department's goals and to the institutional goals.

Section II. Teaching - A reflective statement of teaching goals and approaches used.

Suggested Documentation:

Activities demonstrating the adaptation of instruction to teaching goals
Honors or recognitions received for teaching
Sample course materials to include samples of students' responses (a corrected paper, e.g.)
Materials which show the extent of student learning and mastery
Student evaluations
Peer evaluations
Programs, summaries of field trips, other innovative experiences used to broaden the student's knowledge beyond the classroom context

Section III. Scholarly Activities - A reflective statement of scholarly goals and overview of activities, e.g., work in progress, presentation of papers, grantsmanship, national and international focus, curriculum development, etc.

Suggested Documentation:

Copies of papers presented at national, regional or state conferences
Copies of articles published in refereed publications
Letters of grants awards
Copies of peer reviews of works done e.g. newspaper articles which critique one's works
Peer reviews of students' works
Highlights of workshops, seminars conducted, etc
Discussions of workshops attended, classes taken, sabbatical highlights, how knowledge is being developed continuously
Sample products produced - videotapes, workbooks, textbooks, books in print, artwork, etc.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Portfolio Page 3

Section IV. Service - A reflective statement describing the nature of one's contributions to his/her profession, to York College and to the broader community

Documentation:

A list of community boards on which you hold membership
Membership in professional organizations
Lists of conferences attended, sample programs
Letters referencing works done as members of committees
Works documenting effectiveness as a committee person
Membership on committees at York College and evidence of effectiveness
Activities done for students beyond classroom expectations such as mentorship, Honor's program, number of advisees, registrations duties, club sponsorship, program development, internships, assistance with applications to graduate school, international studies, and other experiences

Proposed Guidelines for Content of Portfolios at York College

1. **Documents to be forwarded to CUNY Central Office**
   a. **Curriculum Vitae**
   b. **Memorandum of Evaluation**
   c. **Teaching Evaluation**
   d. **Grading Practices**
   e. **Classroom Observations**
   f. **Copies of publications**

2. **Preface and Table of Contents**

   The preface explains the selection of materials in the table of contents

3. **Framing Statement**

   The framing statement explains the faculty's goals in the context of the mission of the department, college, community (Function and Role)

4. **Reflective Statement**

   This is an intrinsically philosophical and more personal statement designed to pull together the disparate pieces of the faculty's background. It is intended to answer the why of goals in terms of personal values and philosophy.

5. **Samples and Commentaries**

   The selection of at least two samples and commentaries will be used to illustrate two areas of expertise, i.e. advisement (case study), syllabi (samples illustrating changes in teaching areas, preparation of diverse number of courses, etc.).

6. **Relevant Evidence from Others**

   The selection of two pieces of relevant evidence from others is recommended to enhance evaluation of faculty's contribution, i.e. letters from colleagues, former students, etc.

7. **Revised/Enhanced Curriculum Vitae**

   This is in addition to the c.v. included in university evaluation forms and is designed for faculty to enhance the presentation of their areas of expertise.

Faculty Portfolio Development Workshop, June 2-3, 1992
Convener: Dean Daisy C. De Filippis;
Workshop Leaders: Professors Stuart Dick, Elayne Feldstein, Frances Peterson, Howard Ruttenberg, Jack Schlein.
Consultant: Dr. Patricia Hutchings, Teaching Initiative, AAHE

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

The Institution

More than 11,000 students attend Dalhousie University, in Halifax, Nova Scotia, and pursue a wide range of programs. Dalhousie employs 997 full-time and 658 part-time faculty members.

Background

In 1988, Dalhousie's president stated that he would recommend tenure and promotion only for faculty with clearly documented evidence of their teaching ability.

At the same time, the Senate Committee on Instructional Development and the Office of Instructional Development and Technology (OIDT) devised a number of strategies designed to raise the profile of teaching, improve methods of evaluating teaching, and encourage instructional-development efforts. The teaching portfolio was identified as one effective mechanism to help reach these goals.

The OIDT promotes the use of the teaching portfolio by describing the benefits that derive from its preparation and maintenance. In an ongoing series of workshops, faculty are shown, in addition to its obvious utility in presenting evidence of teaching accomplishments for personnel purposes, how the teaching portfolio can prompt reflection on one's teaching, identifying both strengths and weaknesses with a view to enhancing performance.

While the use of the teaching portfolio is highly recommended, it remains voluntary, with faculty free to choose the method of documenting their teaching activities. However, the portfolio concept is gaining widespread support across campus as faculty members discover its many benefits.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Portfolio development is taking root in several departments, as individual faculty members and tenure and promotion committees gain experience in its use. Evidence of a "ripple effect" is growing, as professors, observing how colleagues use the portfolio for career advancement and teaching-improvement purposes, are motivated to adopt the technique for themselves.

Collaboration among faculty is encouraged, and the "pioneers" assist their colleagues in preparing their own teaching portfolios. There is also renewed interest in student ratings of instruction at the departmental, faculty, and institutional levels in an attempt to obtain relevant, reliable evidence of teaching accomplishments. In addition to improving the methods of gathering and using student ratings data, this interest in the teaching portfolio has prompted widespread discussion about teaching and learning on campus, motivating and supporting those interested in enhancing and improving the teaching function.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Decisions about portfolio content are left largely to individual faculty members. However, some departments have developed or are in the process of developing guidelines to reflect their particular teaching contexts. For example, the School of Education suggests portfolios contain information about courses, course content, and teaching methods; evidence of "concern and helpfulness" in dealing with students' various needs and goals; evidence that presentation and

content are clear, relevant, and focused; information about wider involvement in pedagogical activities (e.g., development of teaching materials, participation in teaching organizations, involvement in curriculum development); and evaluative information from colleagues, students, alumni, and administrators.

The OIDT provides advice to individuals and groups about the appropriate content of teaching portfolios and encourages the development of relevant departmental guidelines. In addition, the office has published *Recording Teaching Accomplishment: A Dalhousie Guide to the Teaching Dossier*, which outlines the steps in preparing and maintaining a portfolio and discusses some of the broader issues in the process of evaluating university teaching. The *Guide* has proven to be very popular at Dalhousie, by providing useful, practical advice and by enhancing the credibility of the teaching portfolio concept. Its examples, drawn primarily from the portfolios of twenty-five award-winning teachers across Canada, illustrate the qualities of effective instructors.

Evaluation of Portfolios

No standardized criteria exist for the evaluation of teaching portfolios. Departments have their own guidelines and are at different stages of outlining criteria.

Lacking a comprehensive summary of teaching performance, evaluators have relied heavily on student ratings data. However, important inroads are being made as teaching portfolios present more extensive evidence of teaching accomplishments, supplementing the important but limited information from student ratings.

For tenure and promotion decision-making purposes, teaching evaluation begins at the departmental level, with a committee, then the department as a whole, making recommendations to the appropriate faculty body. The president of the university can overrule decisions made at other levels. Rules of confidentiality do not permit a thorough investigation of how the teaching portfolio is perceived by the various evaluating actors; however, anecdotal evidence suggests that those making tenure and promotion decisions now are demanding — and receiving — more comprehensive evidence of teaching performance.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

Dalhousie's limited experience with teaching portfolios and the confidential nature of the tenure and promotion process make it difficult to determine whether or not evaluators across campus are appropriately interpreting portfolio materials. However, indications are that as more faculty members and administrators become familiar with the teaching portfolio concept, they will establish better evaluation methods and interpretive techniques.

Impact

There has been a tremendous response to portfolio development by faculty and administrators at Dalhousie, and the concept is rapidly gaining in popularity at other campuses across Canada and the United States. More than 500 copies of *Recording Teaching Accomplishment* have been ordered by individual professors and by universities for distribution on their campuses.

Faculty are gaining confidence in the teaching portfolio as a method of documenting their teaching accomplishments. As experience using the portfolio grows, there will be ongoing efforts to gauge its impact on those charged with evaluating teaching performance.

Next Steps

Workshops on the portfolio will continue, as will consultative services for individuals. More sessions are planned at the departmental level, as academic units work to devise policies and procedures for evaluating teaching.

Advice for Other Campuses

Departmental pilot studies should be undertaken. Departments should establish teaching evaluation criteria and guidelines for the content and use of the teaching portfolio.

Materials Attached or Available

- *Recording Teaching Accomplishment: A Dalhousie Guide to the Teaching Dossier* is available from the OIDT for $6.00 per copy; alternately, purchase of the diskette version of the document enables you to produce an adapted version for distribution on your campus. Order from Alan Wright, at the address below.

Contact: Alan Wright
Executive Director, Office of Instructional Development and Technology
Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 3J5
CANADA
fax: 902/494-2319
e-mail: WAWRIGHT@AC.DAL.CA

DOANE COLLEGE

The Institution

Doane is an independent, comprehensive liberal arts college. Founded in 1872 by Congregationalists, it is the oldest college in Nebraska. The college has fifty-five full-time faculty and more than 800 students on its Crete campus; the adult program in Lincoln has more than 500 students enrolled. Doane offers B.S., B.A., M.Ed., and M.A.A. (master's in administrative arts) degrees and has been accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools continuously since 1913.

Background

Prior to the adoption of the portfolio model of faculty review six years ago, many faculty perceived the evaluation process as arbitrary and lacking standardized procedures for the review. The portfolio model seemed to provide a more meaningful approach to evaluation, as well as a new vehicle for faculty to reflect on their teaching. Specific portfolio models at other colleges and universities in Nebraska were examined before Doane adopted its current format.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Portfolios are developed and evaluated for all tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty have been compiling portfolios for at least six years now. While a faculty member might consult a tenured colleague for advice, for the most part portfolios are developed independently.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Portfolios at Doane are structured; faculty follow the "Portfolio Review Worksheet" contained in the *Faculty Handbook*. This worksheet also serves as the model for peer review. Items for inclusion are outlined under four categories: scholarship (vitae, official transcripts, activity reports, record of attendance and presentations at professional meetings, publications); teaching (course objectives/goals, syllabi, tests); student performance (student course evaluations, examples of graded student work/exams/summaries, alumni evaluation summaries); and college and community service (record of service on committees, new course/program design, advisee evaluation summary). An evaluation sheet filled out by the dean on her first visit to the instructor's classroom is also included in the portfolio.

Evaluation of Portfolios

When portfolios are reviewed for tenure and promotion decisions, the faculty candidate recommends six colleagues (some of whom are tenured) to serve on the portfolio review committee. From those six, the academic dean and the division chair select four review committee members.

During the first phase of portfolio evaluation, the faculty member under review sets up a two-hour session where the division chair and the four faculty colleagues raise specific questions about the contents of the portfolio; the faculty member also can answer questions about his/her philosophy of teaching or provide additional information. The division chair writes a summary of the review session, to be placed in the portfolio. Next, the division chair or academic

dean interviews the four colleagues separately for their evaluations. The division chair submits a written recommendation to the dean, who places it in the portfolio. The Faculty Affairs Committee reviews the portfolio and sends a recommendation to the dean, who forwards the recommendation to the president, who then makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

When there are serious questions about the quality of the instructor's teaching, students are interviewed by the dean and/or division chair. These students (usually seven to ten) are chosen randomly and have been enrolled in the instructor's classes.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

The portfolio-development process takes a lot of time. Also, some feel the process may still be problematic because a faculty member chooses his/her own colleagues for the evaluation team, and these colleagues may be reluctant to offer much negative criticism.

Impact

The use of portfolios on campus for tenure and promotion decisions has produced a mixed reaction from faculty. On the one hand, teaching and the talk about teaching are taken more seriously on campus; pedagogical issues now are at the top of the discussion agenda on campus, whereas earlier a defensive appeal to "academic freedom" forced them to take a back seat. On the other hand, some faculty think the evaluation process is still too arbitrary and subject to administrative biases.

Next Steps

Currently, there is an effort to streamline the amount and kind of material that is included in the portfolio.

Advice for Other Campuses

Look carefully at the members of the portfolio review committee to determine their biases about the evaluation process and criteria, the candidate's specialty, and any conflicts of interest.

Materials Attached or Available

- The attached "Portfolio Review Worksheet" is used as a guideline for faculty portfolio development and peer review.

Contact: Glen W. Davidson
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Doane College
Crete, NE 68333

PORTFOLIO REVIEW WORKSHEET

Candidate's Name _____ Date of Evaluation _____

Division _____ List of Courses Involved _____

_____

1. HOW KNOWLEDGEABLE IS THIS FACULTY MEMBER IN SUBJECTS TAUGHT?

Suggested Portfolio Materials
- Degree in teaching field
- Record of attendance at regional or national professional meetings
- Record of lectures/performance, published works, consultations and invitations related to teaching, etc.
- Record of additional education

Suggested Focus in Examining Portfolio Materials
- Has the instructor kept in thoughtful contact with developments in his/her field
- Is the faculty member sought as a resource in content area by students and peers?

Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Comments: _____

_____

_____

2. WHAT IS THE QUALITY OF MATERIALS USED IN TEACHING?

Suggested Portfolio Materials
- Instructor's statement of course objectives/goals
- Course outlines
- Syllabi
- Reading lists
- Tests used
- Study guides
- Descriptions of non-print materials (audio-visuals, computer assisted instruction, etc.)
- Handouts
- Problem sets, simulations, case studies
- Assignments

Suggested Focus in Examining Portfolio Materials
- Is the best work in the field represented?
- Are materials and course content appropriately thorough?
- Is coverage of course content appropriately thorough?
- Are the materials and course content logically organized?

Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Comments: _____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. WHAT KIND OF TASKS WERE SET BY THE TEACHER FOR THE STUDENTS (OR DID THE TEACHER SUCCEED IN GETTING STUDENTS TO SET FOR THEMSELVES), AND HOW DID THE STUDENTS PERFORM?

Suggested Portfolio Materials

- Statement of evaluation criteria
- Copies of graded exams
- Examples of graded research papers/ term papers
- Examples of teacher's feedback to students on written work
- Descriptions of student performances; e.g., class presentation, etc.
- Description of activities in supervising students in the field
- Examples of completed assignments
- Grade distributions

Suggested Focus in Examining Portfolio Materials

- Was the level of performance required and achieved appropriate for the course?
- Was an appropriate quality of work given an A? B? C?, etc.
- Are student tasks consistent with the course's expected contributions to the department's curriculum?
- Was adequate feedback provided to students?
- How adequately do tests or assignments represent the kinds of student performance specified in the course objectives?
- Do the requirements appropriately address critical skills development (e.g., reading, writing, speaking, listening, thinking, computation)?

Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Comments: _____

_____

4. HAS THIS FACULTY MEMBER ASSUMED RESPONSIBILITIES RELATED TO THE DEPARTMENT'S OR COLLEGE'S TEACHING MISSION?

Suggested Portfolio Materials

- Record of service on standing comm., special comm. (e.g., to examine grading policies, admission standards, etc.)
- Evidence of design of new courses and programs
- Evidence of involvement in student advisement
- Statement of activities engaged in to improve teaching
- Description of activities in a field setting (other than supervising students)

Suggested Focus in Examining Portfolio Materials

- Does this faculty member take an active role in the improvement of instruction in the department?
- Has the instructor demonstrated a willingness to direct efforts toward the instructional needs of the department or college?
- Does the faculty member accept responsibility for instructing an appropriate number of students?
- Has he or she sought feedback about teaching quality, explored alternative teaching methods, made changes to increase student learning?
- Does the faculty member make valuable contributions in the area of student advisement?

Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High

Comments: _____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

The Institution

Evergreen State College is located in Olympia, Washington, and is attended by more than 3,500 students. The master's degree is its highest offering. The college was established in 1967.

Background

Teaching portfolios are intended for reappointment purposes and have been in use since the institution opened. The faculty have either three- or eight-year contracts, depending on whether they have been at Evergreen six years. Reappointment decisions determine whether a faculty member gets another contract.

Collaborative teaching quality is the primary qualification for faculty contracts, and the portfolio constitutes the bulk of the information used in reappointment decisions. Because there are no faculty ranks and faculty salaries are determined by an established salary scale, no promotion or merit pay decisions are made. The portfolio also is used for faculty development.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

All faculty, other than one-year visitors, must maintain portfolios. Academic deans, the provost, and librarians keep them, as well. (At one time, students were expected to maintain portfolios that included narrative evaluations and samples of their work.)

Faculty are told that maintaining portfolios is *central* to their reappointment. New faculty receive guidance from academic deans about portfolio content and are assigned to teaching teams; these team colleagues provide most of the information new faculty learn about compiling portfolios. Eventually, most faculty learn that a good filing system helps to keep portfolios in order; others scramble at the last minute to assemble portfolios when the deans call for them.

Beyond reappointment, faculty are asked to provide their portfolio on any occasion that calls for a review of the faculty member's experience. Candidates for academic dean must provide their portfolio for review to the entire academic community, and nominees for the Burlington Northern Award for Excellence in Teaching are asked to submit portfolios for review by the selection committee.

Members of a faculty teaching team may choose to share their portfolios to get to know one another's work better. Some faculty offer the opportunity to examine their portfolios to students (minus the student papers, for confidentiality).

Portfolio Design and Contents

Most portfolios look alike in terms of their organization. Faculty teach only one program at a time, which is the equivalent of a student's full-time work. Faculty organize all the material required by the reappointment policy by program, which could be one quarter or one year long. Self-evaluations are most often placed at the beginning, with evidence of scholarly or artistic work at the end. Many faculty also have a section documenting guest lectures and other service work done on or off campus.

These portfolios are long; excluding samples of scholarly or artistic work, they average

about 400 pages per year. The bulk of the pages consists of the host of evaluations required by the reappointment policy.

See the attached Section IV of the "Faculty Reappointment Policy," taken from the *Faculty Handbook*, for more details on required portfolio items.

Evaluation of Portfolios

Each portfolio is reviewed by a dean for evidence of competency in teaching, meeting commitments, planning curricula, and service to the college. The dean writes a narrative evaluation substantiating these competencies. If the dean thinks the faculty member has failed to show one of these competencies, then the portfolio is reviewed by all the academic deans, and their majority opinion shapes the evaluation of the faculty member.

Deans usually hold a conference with each faculty member after they have completed the evaluation. In the years that a faculty member is up for reappointment, the deans write a letter of recommendation to the provost either to reappoint or to deny reappointment to the faculty member. In the latter case, the provost typically reviews the portfolio, too.

Impact

That the portfolio depends heavily on the use of evaluations, which are both narrative and mutual in character, is central to the teaching and learning on campus. (All evaluation at the college is mutual: The faculty and student evaluate each other, and teaching team members evaluate one another.) This dependence shapes a context that reinforces both collaborative and reflective teaching and learning.

Next Steps

The use of portfolios for reappointment has been overstressed. The current policy is written primarily to handle fairly the occasional cases of incompetency, but it applies to all faculty, most of whom are doing good work. It is felt that the requirements of the policy — that evaluations address competency criteria — limit the range and reflectiveness of the evaluations faculty write each other and deans write to them.

The institution is likely to retain something close to the current practice for newly hired faculty, but will move to a more developmental form for faculty who have been at the institution for more than six years.

Advice for Other Campuses

Be aware that the particular portfolio you require of your faculty will promote certain teaching practices and discourage others. There is some virtue in including weaknesses and failures as well as strengths and successes in portfolios. Through the various evaluations of a "failure," one can see whether the faculty member learned about teaching because of the failure; and one can differentiate between failures that occurred as a result of the faculty member's risk taking and vitality and those that resulted from a lack of care.

Materials Attached or Available

- See the attached excerpts on portfolio contents from the *Faculty Handbook*.

Contact: Priscilla Bowerman
Academic Dean
The Evergreen State College
L 2211
Olympia, WA 98505

FACULTY HANDBOOK (1988)

IV. THE PORTFOLIO

The portfolio shall generally constitute the bulk of the evidentiary base for interim and reappointment evaluations by the deans and the reappointment decisions of the provost.

The portfolio shall include:

A. annual self-evaluations by the faculty member which shall address but need not be limited to the four critical areas for reappointment described in this policy; and

B. evaluations by and of all faculty colleagues with whom one has taught in the years under review;

In writing an evaluation of a colleague, a faculty member shall remain aware that the function of this evaluation is to inform the deans' evaluations of the faculty member and reappointment recommendation to the provost. Team members shall exchange evaluations and hold a team conference within two weeks of the end of the evaluation week of the quarter in which the program ends.

In the evaluation, the author shall assess specific aspects of the colleague's performance in each of the four critical areas for reappointment.

The author may not have evidence to evaluate the colleague in every critical area or on all aspects of any one critical area. However, the author shall directly and explicitly evaluate the colleague's competency in each aspect for which there is evidence from their work together.

Evaluating competency means that in addressing each aspect the author shall (1) assess the colleague's strengths and weaknesses, and provide specific concrete examples to illustrate and support his assessments, and (2) state his overall judgment of the colleague's competency in this aspect of his work. E.g., an author must go beyond saying and supporting with evidence, "His lectures typically contained a wealth of current, relevant material, demonstrating his careful and intense research of the topic. However, his delivery was poor: he did not organize the material well and he had to rush at the end of most lecture periods to cover all he wished to say." The author shall also make the judgment, "In my opinion, overall, his lecturing did (or did not) meet reasonable standards of competency for lecturing at this college."

An author shall refrain from stating a judgment about reappointment per se. He should not write "He should be reappointed" or the like, for this judgment lies with the deans and provost who have the wider evidentiary base of the full portfolio and who have the comparative perspective which comes from evaluating numerous faculty.

C. All other evaluations required by specialty area or graduate program policies or covenants. These evaluations shall assess the faculty member's performance according to the performance criteria established for those areas in their policies or covenants.

D. All evaluations of the faculty member submitted by students.

Students shall write these when they leave the program. These evaluations shall be included in the faculty member's portfolio to inform the deans' evaluations and reappointment recommendation to the provost. The faculty member shall inform his/her students that the evaluations shall be included in the faculty member's portfolio and shall be read by deans to inform their evaluation of and reappointment recommendation for the faculty member. The faculty member shall give the students a copy of this policy's criteria for reappointment and encourage the students to write their evaluations of the faculty member in terms of these criteria. The faculty member is responsible for encouraging students to write these evaluations and assisting students as needed.

Although students are encouraged to exchange these evaluations with their faculty member during a mutual evaluation conference, students have the option to submit them to the faculty member's program secretary to be held from the faculty member until the registrar has been sent the faculty member's evaluation of the student.

E. Program syllabi, covenants, and program descriptions.

F. Description of participation in college affairs.

G. Interim evaluations from the deans applicable to the current contract period. (See section "Dean's Evaluations of Faculty Members" for a description of the content of these evaluations.)

H. Student self-evaluations.

I. The faculty member's evaluations of students.

J. Any other material the faculty member chooses to include to document his/her work.

Generally, a faculty member need submit only portfolio material from the years subsequent to the last decanal evaluation plus item G above for either interim or reappointment evaluations (except that a faculty member on a second three-year contract must submit a complete five-year portfolio for his/her reappointment evaluation.)

If in reviewing this material (called "most current") the deans identify specific and significant weaknesses in the faculty member's performance, then they may request all of the faculty member's portfolio material for any or all of the years subject to review under the current contract. They shall use this material to assess only the existence, persistence and degree of the specific weaknesses identified in the "most current" portfolio material. The deans shall not use their access to the full portfolio material to identify weaknesses of past performance not cited in Warning Statements in prior decanal interim evaluations written in the years subject to review under the current contract. In this situation, the dean(s) shall use this earlier portfolio material only to address the specific weaknesses identified in the Warning Statements.

Decanal requests for additional portfolio material must be made in a letter to the faculty member which:

1. cites the specific concerns (either past Warning Statements or specific weaknesses identified in the "most current" portfolio material) which the dean(s) wish to explore in the older portfolio material;

2. informs the faculty member of his/her right to respond to these named concerns by writing a letter and/or adding additional materials which addresses these concerns to the portfolio; and

3. states a date by which these materials must be sent to the dean(s) which shall be no sooner than three weeks after this decanal letter is sent to the faculty member. (Responses and additional material sent later than this date are not admissible evidentiary material under this policy.)

The decanal letter and the faculty member's letter of response and/or additional material, if sent by the date set in the decanal letter, shall be added to the faculty member's portfolio.

FAYETTEVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY

The Institution

Fayetteville State University, a constituent institution of the University of North Carolina since 1972, is the second-oldest state-supported institution in North Carolina and one of the oldest teacher-education institutions in the South. Approximately 3,700 students are enrolled in programs that lead to the associate, bachelor's, and master's degrees.

Background

The use of teaching portfolios began as a way of systematically documenting a faculty member's scholarly productions, university service, and public service contributions. Appropriate procedures are established for organizing the data, which include evaluations, sample documents relating to teaching effectiveness and research, and copies of activities and programs designed to promote professional development.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

The portfolio, presented in conjunction with the faculty-evaluation process, is used in making tenure and promotion decisions, for awarding merit pay, and in selecting teaching-excellence award winners. Each faculty member compiles his or her portfolio, which is reviewed by the department chair, peers, the University Committee, and administrators.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Criteria for portfolio content are devised by the university's Faculty Senate and endorsed by the chancellor. Practical evidence is stressed rather than philosophical commentary.

The portfolio takes the form of a three-ring binder and contains a record of teaching performance; service contributions to the university, community, and the profession; research and scholarly contributions; and evidence of involvement that enhances role performance.

Faculty have flexibility in choosing portfolio contents, though the contents must be "relevant." Typical entries include syllabi; letters from department chairs, deans, and students; peer, student, and self-evaluations; vitae; evidence of research relating to teaching, committee work, and student advisement; publications; and special community projects.

Evaluation of Portfolios

Portfolios are evaluated according to the faculty member's performance in regard to teaching, scholarly/creative activities and research, and university and community service.

Results of evaluations, with supporting evidence, are reviewed first by peers, followed by the department chairperson and the college or school dean; the University Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Committee; the vice chancellor for academic affairs; and the chancellor. The Board of Governors makes the final decision for tenure and sends a letter of approval to the chancellor, who communicates the results to the faculty member.

Faculty who perform below the institution's expectations are asked to negotiate a *growth improvement contract* for a specific period.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

Faculty report that although the portfolio is beneficial, portfolio development is time-consuming.

Impact

Portfolio use has helped to standardize the evaluation process. The majority of faculty are diligent in maintaining their portfolios and have reported changes in their teaching performance based on evaluations. Faculty also have become more aware of the evaluation process.

Next Steps

The campus has no immediate plan to discontinue portfolio use, since it is highly recommended for its convenience, for assessing professional outcomes, and for recording longitudinal data.

Advice for Other Campuses

The portfolio should be limited to information that is relevant and current. At present, the portfolio is designed to reflect the most recent information and does not contain information submitted during the previous request for personnel action.

Contact: Callie Coaxum
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Fayetteville State University
237 Collins Administration Building
Fayetteville, NC 28301

GORDON COLLEGE

The Institution

Gordon College, located in Wenham, Massachusetts, is a private liberal arts college with approximately 1,200 students and seventy-one full-time faculty. The college teaches from a Christian world view and a conviction that intellectual development and spiritual formation should be equally intentional.

Background

Gordon College has a long history of gathering information on teaching. Since faculty already were presenting portfolio-like documents for promotion and tenure evaluation, the transition in 1991 to faculty-development portfolios came relatively easily. In this new portfolio model, reflective commentary is included as a way of helping new and younger faculty document and learn from their teaching. Portfolios also are seen as a way for more-experienced faculty, one third of whom will retire in the next five to seven years, to reflect on their "lessons learned." These lessons include teaching methods; muticulturalism in the curriculum; and methods of teaching from a Christian world view, sometimes referred to as "faith-learning integration."

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Portfolio development started on a small scale. By the fall of 1992, four faculty from a variety of disciplines (physics, elementary education, history, and psychology) had compiled portfolios. These instructors were part of a panel presentation at a teaching portfolio workshop for faculty.

The move toward faculty-development portfolios is an extension of Gordon's nationally recognized faculty-development program. More than three quarters of the faculty voluntarily participate in the faculty-development program, and receive an $800 incentive. Portfolio compilers are chosen by the dean and the department chair and receive an additional $150.

Faculty currently focus on one course when developing portfolios and follow guidelines in AAHE's *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching* and Peter Seldin's *Practical Guide*. Though portfolios are created for faculty-development purposes, some faculty have requested that the promotion and tenure committee review their teaching portfolio when evaluating them for tenure.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Portfolio development follows some of the guidelines put forth by outside sources and consultants, but the main thrust of portfolios is reflection on "lessons learned" at Gordon College. Required entries include reflective samples and syllabi. Optional items include videotapes and examples of specific teaching exercises. Additional suggested items include course evaluations by peers and students and the dean's evaluation.

Evaluation of Portfolios

The faculty-development committee reviews portfolios, as does the faculty dean, who gives qualitative, one-on-one feedback. Some portfolios are sent back with suggestions on how to embellish the reflective piece. Additional faculty members may also review portfolios.

During promotion and tenure evaluation, some faculty request that a committee other than the faculty-development committee review their portfolio as evidence.

Impact

It is too early to tell what impact portfolio use will have on the entire faculty. Some older faculty have reported experiencing much satisfaction in reviewing their accomplishments as teachers. Doing this has been a great exercise in reflection about teaching goals for the future, and it has helped faculty to focus more on their teaching.

In terms of institutional impact, it is felt that over time compiling portfolios will reaffirm the importance of teaching, even though Gordon College is a place where many instructors come with the strong desire to be great "teachers."

Next Steps

In 1993, Gordon College will require all new candidates for teaching positions to submit something like a teaching portfolio, which would include reflective statements, syllabi from previous teaching jobs, and peer reviews of teaching. A faculty committee is currently working on guidelines for this required, smaller version.

Advice for Other Campuses

Start portfolio use on a small scale, gradually increasing the level and scope of practice over time.

Portfolio development should start with faculty who are widely admired. At Gordon, this means individuals who are known as strong teachers in their field, some of whom have won teaching awards.

Contact: Jonathan Raymond
Dean of the Faculty
Gordon College
255 Grapevine Road
Wenham, MA 01984

HARVARD UNIVERSITY MEDICAL SCHOOL

The Institution

Harvard Medical School is in Boston, across Charles River from Harvard University in Cambridge; the school has sixteen affiliated teaching hospitals. In addition to the 660 medical students enrolled in classes, the college provides instruction for 4,000 to 5,000 interns, residents, and specialty fellows and a large number of participants in continuing medical education courses.

Background

Until the mid-1980s, the Harvard Medical School evaluated faculty for promotion using criteria for laboratory investigators or clinical investigators; while the faculty's teaching contribution was noted, it was not a major component of the evaluation. By 1987, it had become apparent that a means was needed to recognize the contributions of those faculty who were primarily teachers, not only to medical students but also to residents, clinical fellows in hospital departments, and participants in the many continuing medical education courses given at the Harvard Medical School. In 1987, a committee was appointed by the dean to consider the issue.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

In accordance with the committee's recommendations, a teacher-clinician ladder was established, with its own set of rigorous criteria and with titles and prerogatives identical to those of the other two ladders. Evaluation for appointment in the teacher-clinician ladder requires a teaching portfolio prepared by the candidate, with support from the department head. Some forty-five appointments have been made in this way.

Portfolios by candidates for the teacher-clinician ladder contain data about teaching contributions and accomplishments that have occurred over several years. The portfolio is an opportunity to highlight the faculty member's best work in the educational areas that comprise his or her major teaching responsibilities. The data included are not intended to represent total teaching experience, but rather focus on those areas where the faculty member has made substantial contributions over several years.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Portfolios consist of two sets of documents: One set is assembled from materials collected in the department head's office, including data obtained from student evaluations, evaluations by other faculty members, solicited letters, and an enhanced vita. The second set of materials is compiled *by* the faculty member in the form of self-report about her or his contributions that are local (HMS and hospital teaching effort) and that are regional, national, and international contributions (educational and professional leadership).

Evaluation of Portfolios

Once a faculty member on the teacher-clinician track has completed his or her portfolio for review, it is sent (with other supplementary materials) to the Teacher Clinician Committee on Education for initial review. The committee comments on three areas: the correctness of the track for that particular faculty member; the match of credentials with the criteria at the

proposed academic rank; and additional information that might be added to the portfolio to strengthen the case for promotion.

The committee's comments are then returned to the department head, who appoints an *ad hoc* evaluation committee from among the other members of the department and asks them to produce an evaluation report on the candidate. That report includes: (1) observations about the candidate's teaching strengths, improvements needed and achieved, use of educational materials; (2) identification of articles, books, print and nonprint teaching materials produced by the candidate, along with a systematic review of their content and format; (3) a summary of data from the Teacher-Rating Forms; (4) comment on any letters of reference from the candidate's colleagues in teaching programs or from the Office of Educational Development; and (5) a comparison of the teacher's skills with those of other teachers in the division, the department, and across departments, if appropriate, along with commentary on the importance of the candidate's contribution to the department relative to its needs.

The process concludes when the Promotion Committee makes a recommendation to the dean, who then forwards the appointment to the joint committee of the Governing Boards of Harvard for final approval.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

The advice and support of both the Teacher Clinician Committee and the members of the offices of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development were crucial in the establishment and acceptance of this track both by faculty and by department heads. The committee helped set the standards for the track; the offices helped individual faculty members and department heads prepare the material needed in the appointment process.

Impact

The preparation of the portfolio is seen as a significant step in evaluation in this teacher-clinician ladder. It is not a task that can be treated lightly by the faculty member. The emphasis on rigorous criteria serves to enhance the status of the track and the faculty appointed in it.

Next Steps

The Office of Faculty Affairs and the Faculty Development Office are in the process of preparing a model portfolio for faculty use.

Contact: Janet Hafler
Associate Director for Faculty Development
Harvard University Medical School
260 Longwood Avenue
Boston, MA 02115

MANHATTANVILLE COLLEGE

The Institution

Manhattanville College is attended by 1,200 students. It offers a liberal arts curriculum, as well as M.A. programs in the humanities and education.

Background

Faculty, who were feeling increasingly doubtful about the outcome of tenure and promotion decisions, looked for a new way to document their abilities. The use of student portfolios, already an approved form of documentation on campus, prompted faculty to use them as a model. One by one, faculty started their own portfolios.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Faculty portfolios have been used for ten years. Teaching, community service, and scholarship are the three portfolio competencies. While portfolios are not required by the administration, their use is supported by the faculty committee that reviews them for tenure and reappointment positions; it is in the best interest of each faculty member to submit one.

In compiling their portfolios, individual faculty members seek advice from faculty mentors and from a supportive department chair.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Portfolio contents usually are contained in a notebook or large accordion folder similar to those used for student portfolios. A description of achievements, written by the faculty member, prefaces the portfolio entries.

There is no particular structure to the portfolio nor any required items, but anyone serious about tenure or promotion is likely to include the following: student letters of appreciation; publications or publications-in-progress; course materials, such as outlines, exams, reading lists; evidence of committee work, such as minutes, letters of thanks, proposals formulated; and evidence of teaching and scholarship recognized outside of the college.

Evaluation of Portfolios

The criterion for evaluating portfolios is "excellence." During the tenure and promotion evaluation process, the Faculty Status Committee makes individual assessments and arrives at a decision, which is discussed with the provost. Then, the provost reviews the portfolio and discusses that review with the committee. The provost and committee make separate recommendations to the president, who has the final say.

The faculty member up for review receives a sheet containing statements from the committee, the provost, and the president.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

There are problems in using teaching portfolios to assess *student* learning in a particular faculty member's class. Also, it is a challenge for faculty to translate sometimes intuitive teaching behaviors into concrete evidence. Faculty respond to the challenge with a wide range of materials, from

statistical analysis of grades and enrollments to warm letters and Christmas cards from students. The same class review sheet is used by everyone, and this sheet can reveal only *major* problems with teaching.

Impact

As a result of compiling portfolios, faculty often are more willing to participate in faculty-development activities. Faculty are thinking creatively about their teaching and are developing their own standards for measurement. They also see their portfolio as a means of making themselves better understood and more competitive.

Next Steps

With the help of a FIPSE-funded project, the project director will try to prompt faculty to share insights about what "excellence" means. Faculty have been reticent about making formal statements, although they often informally discuss their own ideas of excellence. Meanwhile, the changing composition of both the Faculty Status Committee and the administration leads to a continual lack of certainty on criteria for good teaching and good scholarship.

The FIPSE project director also will be exploring how portfolio information is disseminated on different campuses, e.g., small versus large.

Advice for Other Campuses

Faculty will use portfolios if they see the value (reappointment or tenure) in compiling them.

The more faculty are involved in reading portfolios, the more useful portfolios will be for faculty-development purposes. Faculty who read their peers' portfolios are interested and challenged by what their colleagues do to establish evidence of their success. Readers get inspiration for their own classes and for measuring their own success.

An outline of what should be demonstrated by a faculty candidate for review is as powerful as the requirements for inclusion in the portfolio. Faculty prove very ingenious in demonstrating a particular "competency" if they know the "competency" will be used to measure their success as a teacher or scholar.

Contact: Catherine R. Myers
Professor of English/Faculty Development
Manhattanville College
Purchase, NY 10577

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The Institution

Miami-Dade Community College, a two-year, public institution in Miami, Florida, employs more than 850 full-time faculty and offers programs of study leading to the A.A. and A.S. degree to more than 50,000 students.

Background

A recent change to a more performance-oriented reward system on campus made portfolios an excellent vehicle through which faculty can "display" themselves in their primary professional responsibilities. For the most part, this includes teaching, advisement, and other services to the college.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Portfolios now are used college-wide in making faculty-advancement decisions. Approximately 350 faculty across campus participated in some phase of portfolio development during the first year of work in the area; the first decisions based on portfolios were made in Spring 1992. Portfolios are used to compile information for tenure and promotion; however, it is felt that they also will serve as an aid for the faculty member to assess and determine personal and professional goals.

In compiling portfolios, faculty are encouraged to visit the four campus Teaching and Learning Centers, where three-hour, small-group workshops are offered. Samples of portfolios are provided, and faculty can return for further consultation and individual attention. Sessions on the department chair's role in the process also are given.

Portfolio Design and Contents

The *Faculty Advancement Manual* provides guidelines for portfolio development and content, including instructions for inclusions and supporting evidence. Examples of supporting evidence, based on a performance narrative of no more than twenty pages, include some of the following: teaching and evaluation techniques, evidence of curriculum development, evidence of out-of-classroom activities that enhance student learning, peer review statements, and a current curriculum vita. (See the attachments from the *Faculty Advancement Manual* for more details.)

Evaluation of Portfolios

Peer committees review portfolios using criteria contained in the *Faculty Advancement Manual* and based on the qualities detailed in the *Statement of Faculty Excellence*. Committees are trained together to ensure college-wide consistency in decisions. Administrative review of portfolios is a component of the decision-making process.

Faculty performance is measured in the areas of motivation, interpersonal skills, knowledge base, and application of knowledge base. Promotions and tenure are granted based on attainment of standards in these areas. There are no quotas.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

The center has tried to provide help early and in a "systematic manner"; instead, faculty have asked for the most assistance as portfolio submission deadlines draw near.

Impact

The campus has made a massive introduction of portfolio use. It is anticipated that it will take several years before all the participants in the process will understand how to play their respective roles.

Next Steps

In succeeding years, the Teaching and Learning Center will have a greater array of real examples of portfolios to use in portfolio workshops, and the center's staff will be better able to provide assistance after several "cycles" of experience.

Advice for Other Campuses

Use samples in workshops! Faculty report that no matter how thorough the explanation or descriptions of portfolios, seeing actual examples is essential.

Don't underestimate the amount of training and assistance faculty will need.

Materials Attached or Available

- The attached excerpt is from the *Faculty Advancement Manual.*

Contact: Mardee Jenrette
Director, Teaching/Learning Project
Miami-Dade Community College
300 N.E. 2nd Avenue
Miami, FL 33132

PROCEDURE NUMBER: 2355

PROCEDURE TITLE: THE PERFORMANCE PORTFOLIO

EFFECTIVE DATE: JANUARY 1, 1991

BASED ON POLICY: II-69B: GUIDELINES FOR THE ISSUANCE OF CONTINUING CONTRACTS FOR FACULTY

II-69C: GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ACADEMIC RANKS AND PROMOTION PROCESS FOR FACULTY

II-69D: ESTABLISHMENT OF A FACULTY ENDOWED CHAIR PROGRAM

PURPOSE:

A performance portfolio is required of candidates for continuing contract, promotion, or an Endowed Chair. It is not required for annual performance reviews. Rather, some of a faculty member's annual performance reviews become part of the performance portfolio.

PROCEDURE:

I. A faculty member applying for continuing contract, promotion, or an Endowed Chair will prepare an appropriate performance portfolio.

II. The Teaching/Learning Center on each campus has the responsibility of assisting faculty members in preparing performance portfolios.

III. Candidates for continuing contract will present the performance portfolio to the Departmental Continuing Contract Committee by February 5. Candidates for promotion will submit the performance portfolio to the immediate supervisor by February 5 and to the Promotions Committee by March 1. Candidates for an Endowed Chair will submit the performance portfolio to the Campus Endowed Chair Committee by March 1.

CONTENTS OF THE PERFORMANCE PORTFOLIO

1. The faculty member will write a narrative of no more than twenty typed double-spaced pages containing:

   A. A description of how the criteria for continuing contract (procedure 2140), or promotion (procedure 2222), or Endowed Chair (procedure 2353) have been met.

   B. A summary of items the candidate chooses to add to those that are required.

   C. Cross-references within the narrative and summary to show the location of supporting documentation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. The faculty member will provide supporting documentation for the narrative (and summary of optional items, if any are included) with an appropriate method of locating items indicated in the narrative (and summary). Facsimiles are acceptable in lieu of original documents.

III. The faculty member will include the following forms:

A. Three or more performance reviews as required by the procedural criteria for the continuing contract, promotion, or Endowed Chair (or as many as are available while this procedure is being phased in).

B. Student feedback reports for the past three years (or as many as are available while this procedure is being phased in).

C. Self Assessments for the past three years (or as many as are available while this procedure is being phased in).

IV. Format for Presentation

A. The narrative (and optional information) will be presented in a folder.

B. Documentation which can fit into a three-ring binder should be placed in one for presentation.

C. Displays of art work, videotapes, or similar items used as supporting documentation must be suitably and protectively packaged so they can be transmitted easily to the persons or committees considering the performance portfolio.

EXAMPLES OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

The following is a list of possible categories to be used as supporting documentation. These are not inclusive or exclusive categories but only a guide. Faculty members should include specific items from these and/or other categories which support their summary statements. Where possible, data based evidence is preferred.

1. Examples of courses taught.
2. Examples of individualized instruction or counseling.
3. Examples of teaching techniques.
4. Examples of evaluation techniques.
5. Examples of instructional materials.
6. Evidence of availability to students and advisement.
7. Evidence of teaching/learning research such as student performance and retention rates.
8. Evidence of curriculum development and/or course revisions.
9. Evidence of out of classroom activities that provide services to enhance student learning.
10. Evidence of keeping current in teaching/learning and/or discipline such as workshops, seminars, conferences, institutes, courses, publications, professional affiliations, presentations, etc.
11. Evidence of creative endeavors in teaching/learning and/or discipline.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. Peer review including statements from colleagues.
13. Evidence of honors or other recognition.
14. Unsolicited statements from past or present students.
15. Current curriculum vita.
16. Evidence of community participation that is consistent with the mission of the College.
17. Evidence of departmental, divisional (or equivalent), campus and/or College contributions and/or leadership roles.
18. Evidence of professional activities in the arts, athletics, science, etc.
19. Evidence of adequate record keeping including attendance and grades.
20. Evidence of other contributions to the College such as recruitment and promotional activities, fund raising, grant writing, sponsoring student organizations, or participating in special events.
21. Other supporting documentation considered pertinent.

End of Procedure: 2355

MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY

The Institution

More than 8,000 students attend Murray State, in Murray, Kentucky, where they can pursue A.A. to specialist degrees in six academic colleges and 136 programs of study. There are approximately 368 full-time faculty.

Background

Portfolios are part of a new teaching evaluation system that the institution began phasing in over the 1991-92 academic year, in part because of dissatisfaction with its dependence on student evaluations alone (which were seen to be of limited value). The new system, designed by a provost-appointed task force, attempts to give *real* consideration to teaching excellence in overall faculty evaluation; include multiple sources of data for evaluating teaching; and provide for greater fairness, consistency, and flexibility in evaluating teaching.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

All full-time faculty are compiling portfolios, which will be used for self-improvement and, beginning in Spring 1993, for tenure, promotion, and merit pay decisions. The Faculty Resource Center is conducting workshops and training on portfolio development; faculty are encouraged to collaborate as they work on their portfolios.

Portfolio Design and Contents

The guidelines for portfolios specify that the following items be included: (1) a reflective statement focusing on teaching philosophy and responsibilities, instructional strategies, efforts to improve, the relationship between current research and courses taught, the direction of student research, and course constraints; (2) course syllabi; (3) examinations; (4) examples of graded papers or projects; and (5) a summary of student ratings. Additional items may be specified by departments or colleges.

Evaluation of Portfolios

Departments currently are developing criteria for evaluating portfolios. Evaluation will be done at the department level by committees consisting of the chair and two other faculty elected by the department; the elected members will serve staggered two-year terms. Results will be forwarded to the provost via deans. Faculty are given the opportunity to challenge the results.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

Portfolios now are required by mandate from the provost. But it has been difficult, so far, to convince some faculty that portfolios can give them meaningful input into their own evaluation; they see portfolios as a "time-consuming chore" without much reward, particularly in the face of state-wide budget cuts and decreases in faculty salaries. Other faculty are beginning to see the potential of portfolios for their own course development and improvement, as well as for departmental program development and improvement.

Next Steps

It is hoped that the experience of portfolios will demonstrate their value to faculty. Credibility also is at issue: Careful monitoring is needed to ensure that portfolios meet criteria and that those persons evaluating them apply meaningful standards.

Contact: Marian M. Posey
Director, Faculty Resource Center
Lowry Center
Murray State University
Murray, KY 42071

OTTERBEIN COLLEGE

The Institution

Otterbein is a private, four-year liberal arts college located in Westerville, Ohio. Approximately 2,500 students attend the college and pursue a four- or five-year baccalaureate degree program. A master's program in education also is offered.

Background

The Education Department chair (formerly the associate academic dean) was tired of the "top down," hierarchical approach to evaluation. AAHE's *The Teaching Portfolio* monograph prompted a polling of faculty about the idea, which was greeted with enthusiasm. Faculty saw teaching portfolios as a way to put forward their *own* evidence of teaching ability. Student evaluations were seen as a flawed instrument when used by themselves for assessing teaching. Faculty could document their own progress, instead of being told how well they were doing at the end of the year.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

"Quasi-portfolios," or dossiers, are used on campus for renewal, tenure, and promotion purposes. However, only the Education and Speech departments use portfolios for faculty-development purposes. Chairs in the two departments meet with faculty at the beginning of the year and agree on expectations that will be measured by the contents of the portfolio.

In the Education Department, all eleven full-time faculty are using portfolios. The chair and faculty members meet early in Fall, and then again during the Winter term for a midcourse update. Portfolios comprise a faculty member's departmental file; are used to track progress during the year; and prompt discussion between faculty and the chair about course successes, disappointments, revisions, and so on. Faculty in the Education Department collaborate, share portfolios, and sit in on one another's classes.

Portfolio Design and Contents

The Education Department's guidelines for portfolios require the following entries: (1) an outline of objectives for teaching, scholarship, and service to the department, college, community, students; (2) descriptions of how these objectives can be accomplished and the support needed to fulfill them; (3) evidence or materials that show ways of accomplishing the goals; and (4) a narrative summarizing whether or not the goals were met. The department chair recommends that reflective pieces on teaching be included, as well as peer reviews.

Evaluation of Portfolios

Faculty members meet with the department chair early in the academic year to discuss course goals and objectives, and then they meet again for an update during Winter term to discuss progress and/or problems. In Spring, the department chair reviews the portfolio, gives qualitative written feedback to the faculty member, and then sends an annual report to the academic dean. The series of annual reports compiled by the department chair is reviewed by the academic dean and the College Personnel Committee when the faculty member is up for tenure/promotion.

In certain situations, the dean will meet with the faculty member to discuss the portfolio.

Salary decisions are based in large part on the chair's analysis of the teaching portfolio. Each year, the department chair and dean review portfolios for salary recommendations using evaluation criteria in the *Faculty Manual*. When individuals are eligible for tenure and promotion, the Education Department Personnel Committee looks at the actual portfolio and makes a recommendation to the College Personnel Committee.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

Convincing faculty across campus that portfolio development is a worthwhile venture has been an obstacle to portfolio use on campus, especially since portfolios seem to take a lot of time to develop and evaluate.

Impact

As a result of compiling portfolios, faculty have become more conscious of their teaching techniques and have taken steps to incorporate new and better activities in the classroom that engage students in their learning. For example, faculty are using small groups, journals, cooperative learning, and self-assessment techniques. Also, new conversations are taking place among faculty about their teaching, in large part due to peer visits and evaluations. Conversations about connecting scholarship and teaching also are occurring.

Next Steps

A next step on campus is to persuade additional departments to use portfolios as vehicles for teaching enrichment.

Advice for Other Campuses

Include peer reviews in portfolios. Try to streamline the process to eliminate unnecessary paperwork.

Contact: Harriet R. Fayne
Chair, Education Department
Towers #418
Otterbein College
Westerville, OH 43081

SAINT NORBERT COLLEGE

The Institution

Saint Norbert College is located in DePere, Wisconsin, and offers a liberal arts curriculum and a small graduate program in theology. More unusual, its 2,000 students and 115 full-time faculty take part in collaborative learning projects. Students and faculty are known to team-teach and develop courses together.

Background

In 1978, the academic dean took the initiative to change the college's approach to faculty evaluation so that the process would be more open and constructive, and the evaluation materials themselves far more comprehensive.

The first step in this direction was taken when division chairs started evaluating faculty according to specific guidelines and including feedback from students and colleagues and student evaluations. Next, faculty were asked to write self-evaluative essays, and division chairs and faculty got together for sessions to go over these essays and other materials. The goal was twofold: to help the faculty member improve his/her own teaching and to help the faculty member recognize his/her progress in moving toward tenure and promotion.

Since 1985, a comprehensive faculty-development program has been in place. The dean and the president of the college have been supportive and have given the Office of Faculty Development complete autonomy in shaping the portfolio-development process on campus.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Portfolios are not mandated; nor are there typical portfolios. The main purpose of portfolio development is to enhance teaching and to communicate what's happening in the classroom.

The director of faculty development initiates training workshops and provides consultative sessions. Collaboration in compiling portfolios is encouraged, and the Office of Faculty Development sponsors portfolio workshops for new faculty and their mentors. Already, at least thirty-five to forty faculty from a broad spectrum of disciplines are using teaching portfolios, including faculty from biology, physics, and anthropology. In two years, all faculty on campus will have taken part in portfolio-development workshops.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Faculty may choose portfolio contents, though suggested entries include some of the following: syllabi, a reflective statement on teaching philosophy, interpretation of student evaluations, student work, exams, journal publications, and evidence of participation in activities/associations that are related to teaching. For more examples, see the attached "Identifying the Artifacts of Teaching."

Evaluation of Portfolios

Division chairs review teaching portfolios once a year with nontenured faculty. In a typical session, the division chair and the faculty member share their perceptions of the faculty member's progress in teaching and progress toward promotion. The portfolio itself is not viewed as a

tenure document, but is used to assess teaching and the likelihood of future promotion and tenure.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

In compiling portfolios, faculty are surprised and frustrated to learn about things they have not been doing in their teaching.

Impact

As a result of compiling teaching portfolios, many faculty are making changes and improvements in their syllabi, as well as in their classroom methods. A more far reaching development is that faculty are reporting that they are now demystifying the teaching-learning process by explaining to students why they are using certain teaching and learning strategies. In addition, faculty now better understand the importance of generating and sharing a teaching philosophy.

Next Steps

The Office of Faculty Development will be focusing more attention on ways to refine portfolio-evaluation procedures. Also, the director of faculty development soon will work toward creating a "scholarship portfolio" format that can serve as an effective vehicle for documenting Classroom Research and other pedagogically oriented scholarship.

Advice for Other Campuses

Make teaching portfolios a "grass roots" initiative. Get faculty ownership of portfolios. Mandating portfolio development only creates faculty resistance.

Materials Attached or Available

- The attached sheet, "Identifying the Artifacts of Teaching," has been used in teaching portfolio workshops.

Contact: Kenneth J. Zahorski
Director of Faculty Development
St. Norbert College
DePere, WI 54115

IDENTIFYING THE ARTIFACTS OF TEACHING *

K.J. Zahorski

#1 Planning and preparing for the course:

a. Representative course syllabi —

b. Analytical statement on selection of texts, outside readings, and classroom materials —

c. Reflective essay describing teaching philosophy, objectives, and methodology —

#2 Teaching the Course:

a. Analytical description of steps taken to evaluate and improve one's teaching: e.g. reading teaching journals; administering student rating surveys; attending workshops; obtaining institutional professional development grants) —

b. Statements from peer observers (e.g. colleagues auditing classes or serving as team teachers, or colleagues for whom you've guest taught) —

c. Statements from colleague who have systematically reviewed such things as syllabi, classroom materials, text selection,and testing/grading practices —

d. Unsolicited testimonials from current students and alumni —

e. Student course evaluation data (e.g. SOOTS results) —

f. Documentation of teaching improvement exercises from Office of Faculty Development —

g. Statement from Divisional Chair assessing teaching performance —

h. Honors or other recognition of teaching excellence (e.g. Leonard Ledvina Outstanding Teaching Award) —

i. Videotape of professor teaching an entire class period —

j. Student scores on pre- and post-course standardized exams —

k. Student work (e.g. essays,creative works,field-work reports, lab workbooks/logs) —

l. Record of students succeeding in advanced study in field —

m. Student publications or presentations on course-related work —

n. Information about effect of professor's courses on student career choices and employment

#3 Assessing student learning and giving them feedback:

a. Examples of exams and quizzes —

b. Examples of graded and annotated student essays/exams showing excellent, average, and paper work, along with the professors comments on why they were so graded —

c. Analytic essay on grading philosophy, along with a statistical study of grading patterns

#4 Keeping up with the evolving professional discourse about your field and how to teach it:

a. Contributing to, or editing, a professional journal on teaching —

b. Invitations from within and outside campus to deliver papers, demonstrate effective instructional methods, facilitate workshops, lead seminars, etc. —

c. Participation in local, state, regional, or national activities/organizations related to teaching-learning —

* The following schematic is a compilation of information and listings from Peter Seldin's *The Teaching Portfolio* (Anker, 1991) and R. Edgerton, P. Hutchings, and K. Quinlan's *The Teaching Portfolio* (AAHE, 1991). The four core tasks of teaching came from Lee Shulman's Standford Teacher Assessment Project.

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

The Institution

More than 31,000 students attend San Diego State University and pursue a variety of fields of study. The master's degree is the highest offering.

Background

Five years ago, the English Department started requiring teaching assistants to compile portfolios each semester. Teaching portfolio development was initiated with three purposes in mind: (1) to prepare TAs to see themselves as professionals; (2) to allow TAs to reflect on and get practice in documenting their teaching in ways similar to those used by full-time faculty; (3) to create a vehicle for TAs to write and talk about their teaching; and (4) to create a more substantial way of evaluating TAs — other than the exclusive use of student teaching evaluations and class visits.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Currently, all fifty teaching assistants in the English Department are compiling portfolios. TAs in the M.A. program are required to compile portfolios for four semesters; M.F.A. (creative writing) students compile them for six.

TAs visit with the advisor twice during the first semester to discuss results of a class visit and then meet again to review the semester and set goals. TAs are encouraged to collaborate with one another and share experiences. The English Department also has available a TA handbook, which includes portfolio samples.

Portfolio Design and Contents

The TA portfolio has two main components: the Reappointment File and the Teaching Growth Portfolio, which must be maintained each semester. Required entries and dates for completing portfolios are outlined each semester for both the Reappointment File and the Teaching Growth Portfolio.

In the first semester of teaching, TAs must include a teaching evaluation from a faculty member who has observed a class taught by the TA. Also, samples of undergraduate student essays, with commentary, must be included in the Teaching Growth Portfolio the first semester. By the fourth semester (usually the final semester of teaching), TAs are required to include commentary on grade distributions from previous semesters, commentary on student evaluations, and a teaching rationale. (See the attached "English and Comparative Literature Faculty Development Plan for TAs," which outlines specific portfolio items.)

Evaluation of Portfolios

English Department TAs are reappointed on a semester basis. Portfolios are not ranked, although the Composition Committee and the Graduate Committee review them and consult with the TA advisor for a recommendation or denial for the following semester. Most TAs, however, are reappointed every semester. When problems in the TA's teaching ability have been perceived, student evaluations may also be reviewed.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

Compiling portfolios is time-consuming for TAs and for the TA advisor who reads and evaluates them. But requiring TAs to include commentary with their student evaluations and grading procedures allows TAs to control how the information is interpreted and reflected in their portfolios.

Impact

The process of organizing portfolio materials has helped TAs to think about their teaching. Feedback each semester from the advisor has allowed TAs to make immediate changes in their teaching, as well. Also, as a result of compiling teaching portfolios, TAs already have a written teaching rationale and a current curriculum vita completed — documents that will supplement job applications and provide a basis for letters of recommendation.

Next Steps

More workshops on preparing the portfolios will be offered in the future.

The TA advisor is always looking for a more organized portfolio-development and evaluation process, since fifty portfolios must be read each semester.

Advice for Other Campuses

Instructors should "learn by doing" portfolios. Portfolio development should not be a clerical task, *per se*.

Materials Attached or Available

- See the attached requirements for inclusion in the TA Reappointment File and the Teaching Growth Portfolio, which are specified by semester.

Contact: Shirley Rose
English Professor and Director of Composition Faculty Development
Department of English and Comparative Literature
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182

SDSU/English and Comp. Lit. Faculty Development Plan for TAs
Fall 1992

FIRST SEMESTER TAs

PART I: REAPPOINTMENT FILE

The following items are due to the Director of Composition Faculty Development by NOVEMBER 1: (These items may be reviewed by the Composition Committee in making reappointment recommendations to the Graduate Committee.)

1. Evaluation Observation* in the first 5 weeks by any of the following:
   --any tenured faculty member
   --Director of Composition Faculty Development (S. Rose)
   --Director of Composition Program Development (S. Little)
   --Cezar Ornatowski, rhetoric specialist
   If the TA receives a "not competent" evaluation, a second, follow-up evaluation observation can be scheduled by the 8th week of class.

2. Syllabus: copy on file with Director of Composition

3. Status Report* from instructors for classes TA is enrolled in (to be submitted to the Graduate Coordinator)

PART II: TEACHING GROWTH PORTFOLIO
The following items are due by DECEMBER 1:

1. One or more Consultation Observation(s)* by any college-level teacher at SDSU who has visited your class or observed a student conference

2. Student Essays with Commentary: sample (consisting of at least three essays of varying levels of competency, with teacher's written commentary and indication of the grade each would receive if graded) on file with Director of Composition

3. Conference with Director of Composition (during last 3 weeks of class)

4. Observation* of another writing teacher's class (may use consultation form)

*Standard forms are available for these items. Letters may be substituted and may be especially useful to GTAs preparing for job searches or graduate school applications.

SECOND SEMESTER TAs

PART I: REAPPOINTMENT FILE
The following items are due to the Director of Composition Faculty Development (DOC) by NOVEMBER 1: (These items may be reviewed by the Composition Committee in making reappointment recommendations to the Graduate Committee.)

1. Evaluation Observation* in the first 8 weeks by any tenured faculty member. If the TA receives a "not competent" evaluation, a second, follow-up evaluation observation can be scheduled by the 10th week of class.

2. Syllabus: Current copy on file with DOC

3. Student Essays with Comments: sample on file with DOC (may be sample from first semester Teaching Growth Portfolio, if appropriate)

PART II: TEACHING GROWTH PORTFOLIO
The following items should be placed on file with the DOC by DECEMBER 1:

1. TA's Summary and Commentary on Student Evaluations of teaching in previous semester

2. 1 or more Consultation Observation(s)* by any college-level teacher at SDSU

3. 1 or more Consultation Observations for any other teacher

4. ONE of the following
   a. Written Self-Evaluation Report, including documentation. Documentation includes the following in addition to a current syllabus and samples of student writing with teacher commentary:
      -- samples of handouts and exercises
      -- descriptions of observations of other teachers' classes
      -- list of professional growth activities, such as attendance at a professional conference or additional teaching-related reading

   b. Teaching Rationale (statement of teaching philosophy and approach to teaching writing)

   c. Current curriculum vitae appropriate to a search for a position teaching writing

   d. Other appropriate document or materials approved by DOC

All materials will be placed in previously established Teaching Growth Portfolio.

THIRD OR FOURTH SEMESTER TAS

PART I: REAPPOINTMENT FILES
The following items are due to the Director of Composition Faculty Development by NOVEMBER 1: (These items may be reviewed by the Composition Committee in making reappointment recommendations to the Graduate Committee.)

1. TA's Summary and Commentary on Student Evaluations of teaching (may be commentary submitted for Teaching Growth Portfolio in previous semester if appropriate)

2. TA's Commentary on Grade Distributions for previous semester (may be commentary submitted in previous semester)

PART II: TEACHING GROWTH PORTFOLIO
The following items should be placed on file with the DOC by DECEMBER 1:

1. One or more Consultation Observations* by any college level teacher at SDSU

2. One or more consultation observations for any other teacher

3. TWO of the following, for third semester TAs
   THREE of the following, for fourth semester TAs
   a. Written Self-Evaluation Report, including documentation. Documentation includes the following in addition to a current syllabus and samples of student writing with teacher commentary:

      -- samples of handouts and exercises
      -- descriptions of observations of other teachers' classes
      -- list of professional growth activities, such as attendance at a professional conference or additional teaching-related reading

   b. Teaching Rationale (statement of teaching philosophy and approach to teaching writing)

   c. Current curriculum vitae appropriate to a search for a position teaching writing

   d. Other appropriate document or materials approved by DOC

FIFTH AND SIXTH SEMESTER TAs

PART I: REAPPOINTMENT FILES: Submit Teaching Growth Portfolio from Previous semester by NOVEMBER 1 only if you are applying for re-appointment.

PART 1I: TEACHING GROWTH PORTFOLIO: Provide documentation for one of the following activities:
--leading a workshop for writing teachers
--chairing a TA committee
--other professional activity approved by DOC

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

The Institution

Syracuse University, in Syracuse, New York, is a private university with approximately 10,000 undergraduate students, 6,000 graduate and law students, and more than 900 full-time faculty.

Background

For the past several years, Syracuse University has had under way an ambitious, multifaceted project entitled "Changing Priorities in Higher Education," aimed at raising the level of attention to teaching and bringing campus policy and practices into alignment with institutional mission. Toward these ends, portfolios now are being developed and used in a number of contexts, both for improvement and for evaluation.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

At present, in most contexts, portfolio use is voluntary; however, the L.C. Smith College of Engineering and Computer Science and the S.I. Newhouse School of Public Communications now require portfolios, and additional programs may move in this direction as part of Syracuse University's response to an institution-wide mandate to modify policies, standards, and procedures for faculty performance evaluation, in accordance with the following: (1) an increased emphasis on teaching and academic advising and the integration of research into teaching; (2) an improved set of procedures (e.g., self-review, student evaluations, peer review, teaching "portfolio" review, etc.) for both "formative" and "summative" evaluation of teaching and for the evaluation of academic advising; (3) annual evaluation of all faculty, nontenured and tenured, in the areas of teaching and advising; (4) an appropriate balancing of emphasis on the three traditional areas of teaching, research, and service, with teaching accorded emphasis at least equal that of research, scholarship, and creative professional activity; (5) an explicit response to an expanded definition of scholarship, including the relative weighting of the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching — and, where appropriate, creative professional activity.

The Center for Instructional Development provides workshops and other assistance for faculty who are developing portfolios in keeping with the above guidelines.

Also, as part of a three-year effort supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and Pew Charitable Trusts, entitled the "Future Professoriate Project," graduate teaching assistants and associates now are developing portfolios, which are both a tool for self-reflection and a way of documenting experience and effectiveness for future employers.

The Future Professoriate Project recently organized a successful colloquium on the teaching portfolio. A panel of five graduate students presented their portfolios-in-progress to an audience of more than sixty interested faculty. Following the panel, small groups met to discuss important themes and issues, including (1) the need to construct various portfolio formats, including an executive summary or dossier for prospective employers; a fuller, but selective version for internal departmental reviews; and a "filing cabinet" of teaching artifacts easily accessed when the portfolio requires modification; (2) the seminal importance of the portfolio's

reflective essay; (3) the critical nature of the personal interactions between graduate students constructing portfolios and their faculty mentors (the process of talking about teaching was deemed as important, if not more important, as the portfolio itself); (4) strategic use of the portfolio in the academic job hunt, including when it's helpful and the potential for "back-firing"; (5) the importance of collecting portfolio artifacts from "day one" (it might sound obvious, but one of the challenges of portfolio development is collecting and filing artifacts that one might want to eventually include).

The most extensive use of portfolios at Syracuse is within the Writing Program; guidelines and procedures are described in detail in the attached "Charter" (see Appendix).

Portfolio Design and Contents

There is no university-wide prescribed model for the teaching portfolio. The Center for Instructional Development suggests entries that convey information about the teaching context; a statement of current goals; an action plan to be worked out with the chair; and current evidence of the achievement of teaching goals. However, departments determine their own guidelines and procedures. (For example, see the attached materials from the Writing Program.)

Evaluation of Portfolios

In most departments and programs, portfolios have not yet been used for evaluation. The Writing Program has, however, worked out and applied careful procedures for its professional writing instructors (nontenure track), which are described in the attached "Evaluating Professional Writing Instructors: A Charter." The Writing Program also is refining a draft of an evaluation plan for full-time tenure-track faculty. In this plan, full-time faculty are evaluated for yearly raises and for promotion and tenure on two dimensions of achievement: significant intellectual work, and academic and professional citizenship; these two dimensions are to be documented in an "Integrated Portfolio of Intellectual Work and Citizenship."

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

Progress is slow, but deliberately so. Portfolios are seen as one route to change in the institutional culture, which is necessarily evolutionary. Considerable attention has gone into involving relevant parties in the change process, with a focus on "doing portfolios" clearly secondary in most areas of the institution.

One simple step that helped TAs get started with portfolios, however, has been the production of an attractive accordion-pleated, expandable pouch labeled "The Future Professoriate Project: Teaching Portfolio."

Materials Attached or Available

- Materials on the use of portfolios in the Writing Program ("Charter") are attached (see Appendix).
- You may order materials about teaching portfolios being developed by TAs as part of the Pew and FIPSE-funded Future of the Professoriate Project from Leo Lambert at the address below.
- Free materials from the Center for Instructional Development include *Changing Priorities in Higher Education* (an information packet) and *A National Study of the Relative Importance of Undergraduate Teaching and Research at Research Universities: Supported by the Lilly*

Endowment.

- Available free of charge from the Graduate School: *Prospectus: Future Professoriate Project.*
- Also available: *A Guide to Evaluating Teaching for Promotion and Tenure*, by John Centra, Robert Froh, Peter Gray, and Leo Lambert (from Copley Publishing Group, 138 Great Road, Acton, MA 01720).

Contacts: Peter J. Gray
Director of Evaluation and Research
Center for Instructional Development
11 Waverly Avenue, Suite 220
and
Leo Lambert
Associate Dean of the Graduate School
303 Bowne Hall
and
Louise Wetherbee Phelps
Director, The Writing Program
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13244-2320

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

The Institution

Texas A&M is a land-grant, sea-grant, space-grant, Carnegie tier I state university that offers liberal arts, business, professional, and graduate programs to approximately 41,000 students.

Background

There was a need on campus to show that teaching and research are both valued, which meant being able not only to document research and publication but (a harder task) to provide compelling evidence of teaching excellence. The teaching portfolio seemed to be an appropriate vehicle for this task, so workshops were started with the help of an outside consulting team. The associate provost, the dean of faculties, and the speaker of the faculty senate not only supported the workshops but used the first one to compile their own portfolios. This action sent a strong message to faculty that the administration was committed to excellence in teaching.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

During the first week-long teaching portfolio workshop, held in Spring 1992, twenty faculty members completed their portfolios. Faculty represented the colleges of Veterinary Medicine, Liberal Arts, Agriculture, Education, Engineering, Business Administration, and Medicine — almost every college in the university. Portfolios were developed by individual mentoring and at roundtable sessions where there was collegial, interdisciplinary sharing and collaboration.

The Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) sponsored another portfolio workshop in late September 1992. Attendance was voluntary and the session filled quickly. Faculty motives for attending the workshop varied, but most agreed that the primary benefit from the portfolio-development process was the forced introspection about teaching practices and improvement techniques required by the exercise. Attendees included both junior- and senior-level faculty.

Portfolio Design and Contents

The CTE currently is sponsoring research on the structure and use of teaching portfolios. Suggested portfolio entries currently include statements of teaching responsibilities and teaching philosophy, evaluations by colleagues and students, samples of student work, syllabi, videotaped class sessions, teaching honors/awards, a statement by the department chair, and other materials chosen by the person constructing the portfolio.

Evaluation of Portfolios

Current university guidelines for promotion and tenure do not require the development of a teaching portfolio, *per se*. However, the candidate's teaching dossier must include the following: (1) evaluation by colleagues of course materials and grading methods; (2) longitudinal summary of student evaluations of teaching performance; and, (3) evaluation of contributions in nonclassroom teaching situations of value to the department and university. The candidate also is required to supply a statement of teaching goals, strategies, philosophy, and emphasis.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

The time requirement involved in developing a teaching portfolio alarms some faculty. However, faculty who have developed teaching portfolios are almost unanimous in their agreement that doing so is worth the effort.

Impact

Faculty enthusiasm for developing teaching portfolios is increasing, as evidenced by the backlog in demand for additional workshops. Increased administrative attention to evidence of teaching effectiveness in making promotion, tenure, and performance review decisions, coupled with positive word-of-mouth from past workshop participants, has spurred this enthusiasm. In addition, the university's current capital campaign contains a provision for the creation of twenty-five teaching professorships.

Here are some typical responses to portfolio development so far: "I never realized why I do that in my classroom until I did the portfolio." "I'd never put my philosophy of teaching on paper before. Have I got some improvements to make!"

Next Steps

A National Symposium on Teaching Portfolio Use and Evaluation, hosted by the Center for Teaching Excellence, February 25-27, 1993, in San Antonio, will provide a launching pad for next steps.

Advice for Other Campuses

Plan ahead. Several months are required to develop and implement a faculty teaching portfolio workshop. At workshops, have two or three people present who already are doing teaching portfolios and really understand the process. They should serve as mentors during the first teaching portfolio workshop. These might be persons known nationally for their expertise in developing teaching portfolios or faculty from your own campus.

Make certain that faculty understand that teaching portfolios serve as tools they develop. Their input is critical to the usefulness of their portfolios to them.

Contact: Liz Miller
Assistant Director, Center for Teaching Excellence
Texas A&M University
M24246
College Station, TX 77843-4246

TOMPKINS CORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The Institution

Located in Dryden, New York, Tompkins Cortland Community College offers a variety of academic programs leading to the A.A., A.S., and A.A.S. degrees; 70 full-time and 120 adjunct teaching faculty teach approximately 3,000 students.

Background

The College Teaching Center sought to structure conversations about teaching between adjunct and full-time faculty. Adjunct faculty reported that they felt isolated and wanted a way to share teaching expertise and knowledge of their field outside the classroom. Teaching portfolios were thought to provide a vehicle to structure dialogue between adjunct and full-time faculty.

In 1991, a three-year FIPSE grant ("Sharing Excellence in Teaching") was awarded to the college to increase involvement of adjunct faculty in the academic community. To do this, the College Teaching Center organized a Master Teacher Certification Program for adjuncts. One aspect of the program involved full-time faculty acting as "mentors" to adjunct faculty as they created portfolios. Full-time faculty received a stipend for participating in the project; adjunct faculty gained a step on the salary scale when they completed the certification program.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Since September 1991, the primary portfolio developers have been approximately fifty adjunct faculty members taking part in the mentoring program. Through this program, adjunct faculty can receive two out of fifteen required credits toward master teacher certification. Once certification is completed, the adjunct faculty member's name replaces "staff" in course schedules, they are given opportunities to serve as mentors and workshop presenters in the certification program, they receive "preferential treatment" in hiring and scheduling decisions whenever possible, and they receive a step increase on the salary scale.

Portfolios are used exclusively for formative development. In compiling portfolios, adjunct faculty collaborate with the College Teaching Center staff and with full-time faculty mentors at bi-weekly meetings. The College Teaching Center staff keep portfolios confidential; however, portfolios can be shown to interested faculty and the Teaching Excellence Award Committee if a release has been granted by the adjunct faculty member.

Portfolio Design and Contents

The director of the FIPSE grant constructed guidelines and consulted the adjunct core council about what should be included in the portfolios. It was felt that adjunct faculty should have a sense of "ownership" of their teaching portfolios and choose materials to reflect their teaching growth. Typical portfolios contain the following: syllabi, examples of tests, course handouts, transparencies, student evaluations, examples of teaching techniques, graded student work, examples of assessment techniques, and classroom activities. Student evaluations may be added and discussed if the adjunct wishes. In addition, inclusion of one of the following is required: a videotaped class session, with commentary; a classroom observation activity involving the adjunct and full-time professor; or an analysis of a team-teaching situation. Adjuncts must

be observed by mentors and rated on verbal, nonverbal, and visual presentations. Mentors and mentees discuss teaching techniques as a result of reviewing the observation data.

Evaluation of Portfolios

The prime intent of the teaching portfolio is formative rather than summative evaluation. Teaching portfolios are not evaluated as part of retention or promotion reviews, but rather are used as a tool to improve teaching and communication. If an adjunct is nominated for a Teaching Excellence Award, then a committee comprised of a trustee member, a full-time faculty member, and a FIPSE-project representative may review the portfolio. Other faculty members on campus have access to portfolios with permission of the College Teaching Center if the adjunct faculty member has signed a release form.

If an adjunct professor applies for a full-time position on campus and submits his or her own portfolio for review, then it is possible that a dean or department chair will evaluate it. It is the adjunct's participation in the mentoring and certification program that is weighted in employment decisions, not the fact that a teaching portfolio was compiled.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

Evaluation of adjunct teaching for employment purposes is performed by division heads; the use of teaching portfolios is limited to teaching improvement and building rapport within the academic community. Since no direct link exists between portfolios and job retention, alternate sources of motivation were sought. One solution was to develop a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic motivators to encourage participation of both full- and part-time faculty.

Impact

Teaching portfolios have served to structure the mentoring activity and provide a means of talking about teaching.

Adjunct faculty are including more than required amounts of information in their portfolios, and all mentors (full-time faculty or seasoned adjuncts) have volunteered to participate again.

All involved full-timers have reported gaining insight into teaching as a result of working on portfolios with adjuncts. Adjuncts report that the interactive development of teaching portfolios with mentors has helped them feel more comfortable at the college, as well as improved their teaching.

Next Steps

The College Teaching Center is currently working on expanding the portfolio list to include some student feedback and some case study analysis. Student writing portfolios are another option for the future, along with a project to compare student perceptions and faculty expectations in the classroom.

Advice for Other Campuses

Keep confidentiality in mind. Mentors and mentees might include observations in journals that are inappropriate for a public portfolio.

If teaching portfolios are developed for formative or teaching-improvement purposes, and not for end-of-year evaluations, the content may reflect change and improvement instead of evidence of "best practice."

Materials Attached or Available

- See the attached materials on the mentoring process, including a description of the Master Teacher Certification Program.

Contact: Patricia A. Wagner
Director, "Sharing Excellence in Teaching" Grant
Tompkins Cortland Community College
170 North Street
P.O. Box 139
Dryden, NY 13053-0139

PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

COLLEGE TEACHING CENTER

MASTER TEACHER CERTIFICATION: Mentoring Process

1) To indicate interest in being mentored, fill out a mentoring request form (available in the College Teaching Center) or contact Pat Wagner or John Rowe in the College Teaching Center by the end of the first week of classes in the semester chosen for mentoring.

2) If known, names of possible mentors may be suggested to Pat or John. Mentors may be full-time or veteran adjunct faculty 1) from your discipline or department, or 2) whose teaching style provides a valuable model for you.

3) Pat or John will contact the mentor for you, explain the requirements of the program, and ask the potential mentor to agree to the partnership. A $100 stipend will be offered to the mentor for participation.

4) Mentoring relationships that are mutually acceptable will be set up by the end of the second week of classes.

5) The mentor will contact the mentee (mentoree) within one week of being assigned and set up regular biweekly meeting times that are mutually convenient. A minimum of five meetings are required throughout the mentoring semester. The mentoree will pick up a portfolio in the College Teaching Center.

6) The mentor will attend an introductory Training Session.

7) The bi-weekly meetings will include:
   a) Consulting on the mentoree's teaching strengths, concerns, methods used, and student learning assignment strategies in an open atmosphere of collaboration
   b) Discussing syllabus/course-outline requirements
   c) Planning course strategies
   d) Sharing classroom materials
   e) Preparing and evaluating tests
   f) Analyzing student performance
   g) Maintaining academic standards (sharing grading techniques)
   h) A choice of:
      - team teaching
      - exchanging classroom observations
      - or exchanging videotapes of lessons

8) Mentor responsibilities include:
   a) Scheduling bi-weekly meetings which will include:
   b) Keeping an informal brief journal listing the pertinent topics of discussion in the bi-weekly meeting (such as

those listed above).

c) Sharing teaching materials and insights.
d) Creating an open atmosphere of sharing and encouragement.
e) Organizing a team teaching, classroom observation, or exchange of videotapes with the mentoree, and analyzing the experience afterwards (CTC staff are available for assistance if requested).
f) Referring mentorees to designated Faculty Resource Persons if particular concerns arise:
   - Non-biased Teaching: Sandra Pollack, Taf Squires
   - Participatory Teaching Techniques: Fred Coleman, Pat Ryan
   - Teaching the Learning Disabled: Leslie Schettino
   - Teaching Difficult Students: Mary Babish
   - Teaching Critical Thinking Skills: Diane Creel
g) Returning journals to the College Teaching Center at the end of the semester.

9) Adjunct Mentoree responsibilities include:
a) Attending bi-weekly meetings.
b) Sharing teaching concerns and insights.
c) Maintaining an artifacts portfolio containing:
   i) Course outline(s) developed
   ii) Samples of instructional materials
      - overhead transparencies
      - handouts, tests and exams developed
      - student evaluations
      - standardized pre-, post tests
      - sample instructional strategies
      - an introductory activity used
      - a presentation technique used
      - closure techniques
      - a choice of:
        * videotape of lesson (both mentor and mentoree) and analysis
        * team teaching analysis
        * classroom observation analysis

   Note: For items indicated by * forms will be available in the College Teaching Center.

d) Turning in Artifacts Portfolio to the College Teaching Center at the end of the semester.

10) Master Teacher Certification Credit will be granted upon successful completion of the Artifacts Portfolio and Mentor's Journal at the end of the mentoring semester.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRAINING
CORTLAND
COMMUNITY
COLLEGE

Mentor's Checklist:

___ Hold bi-weekly meetings covering such topics as

- ___ syllabus/course outline
- ___ mentee's teaching strengths
- ___ appropriate teaching methods
- ___ student assignments
- ___ planning course strategies
- ___ sharing classroom materials
- ___ preparing and discussing tests
- ___ analyzing student performance
- ___ maintaining academic standards
- ___ sharing grading techniques

___ Keep a brief informal journal of meetings

___ Collect and discuss samples for the portfolio

- ___ course outline developed
- ___ samples of instructional materials
  - ___ overhead transparency (if used)
  - ___ handouts
  - ___ test/ exams developed
  - ___ student evaluations
  - ___ an introductory activity used*
  - ___ a presentation technique used*
  - ___ a closure or lesson assessment technique used *

    * may be included in observation report

___ Observation Activity: a choice of

- ___ videotaped lesson (ideally of both mentor and mentee) with analysis
- ___ classroom observation (ideally of both mentor and mentee) with analysis
- ___ team teaching analysis

TOMPKINS CORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

TOMPKINS CORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mentor's Name:_____ Date of observation:_____

Mentee's Name:_____ Course observed:_____

Type of observation (check one):___videotape___classroom___team teaching

Observation Activity Consultation Form

The purpose of the observation activity in the mentoring program is to provide an opportunity for mutual professional growth and development for the mentor and mentee. These forms are not to be used for evaluative reasons.

As you analyze the observation activity, describe briefly what occurred in each of the categories listed below. Then discuss these descriptions with each other at one of your bi-weekly meetings.

1) Presentation Skills: General Delivery

   A) Verbal

   B) Non-verbal

   C) Use of visual aids

2) Content (knowledge of subject area)

3) Organization

   A) Use of time

   B) Use of supporting material (eg. real-life examples, case studies, examples, exercises, etc.)

   C) Logical flow

4) Student involvement:

5) Other comments:

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER

The Institution

Approximately 20,000 undergraduates and 5,000 graduate students are taught by about 1,100 faculty members at the University of Colorado at Boulder (UCB). Established in 1876, UCB is not only the largest of the four campuses of the University of Colorado but also the largest research university in the Rocky Mountain Region.

Background

Research has been more rewarded than teaching at the University of Colorado at Boulder; it also has been more thoroughly evaluated. Indeed, no formal method has existed for the evaluation of teaching beyond the mandatory student evaluations, known as the Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ).

Since total reliance on one source of information about teaching performance seemed inappropriate, the vice chancellor for academic affairs initiated the requirement that at least one method of teaching evaluation beyond the FCQ must be presented in all reappointment, tenure, and promotion dossiers. This was one impetus behind the portfolio-development effort. As part of this initiative, the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program (FTEP), which was established in 1986 to provide support for faculty in their teaching, was designated to assist faculty create their portfolios.

The role of the FTEP, according to this plan, was to consult with faculty who sought advice on creating portfolios. Assistance would be in the form of one-to-one advising on such matters as the contents, structure, revision, and updating of portfolios.

In addition, the director of the FTEP decided to pilot the service with one department to determine the degree of faculty interest and the extent of the aid they might need. The program was launched in the Communication Department with the encouragement and assistance of its chair. A teaching portfolio workshop was developed and presented to faculty in that department, a faculty member was appointed as liaison, and faculty were invited to come to the FTEP for assistance.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Five faculty members in the Communication Department now have worked with the FTEP to begin developing their portfolios. Two portfolios have been completed. Faculty from a number of other departments also have completed portfolios.

Several factors relate to the spread of the portfolios on the University of Colorado campus at Boulder: (1) The FTEP must distance itself from the evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion purposes. (2) The university's administration has not issued any general guidelines, and thus only informal ones exist as to the nature, contents, structure, and method of judging portfolios. (3) The decision to implement a portfolio requirement has been given to department chairs, thus making adoption a department-by-department effort. (4) Faculty tend to be interested in portfolios mainly in the months before a major personnel review; at any given moment and within any single department, relatively few faculty are motivated to invest the time needed to develop a portfolio. (5) It has become clear that working with faculty on a one-to-one basis

to create a portfolio from scratch can be very time-consuming; the FTEP spends an average of about six hours in individual conferences per completed portfolio.

As a result of these factors, the FTEP has changed its approach to portfolio development in two significant ways.

First, to involve faculty during their first year of teaching in a discussion of pedagogy, the FTEP has initiated a series of symposia called "Becoming a Teacher." One of the sessions in this series is "Creating a Teaching Portfolio," with presentations by a faculty member from the Communication Department who has completed her teaching portfolio, the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the chair of the Theatre and Dance Department.

Second, the director of the FTEP is meeting with department chairs and demonstrating for them how new faculty can establish portfolios. In addition, an effort is being made to begin a collaborative effort among deans, chairs, and faculty members that will result in independent, structured group support for portfolio development.

Portfolio Design and Contents

As indicated above, the administration has issued no general guidelines for portfolio development; only informal ones exist, and they have been evolving over time.

When the FTEP portfolio consultation service began late in 1991, work followed suggestions in the existing literature as to portfolio contents, focusing on such items as student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi and reading lists, student papers, and efforts to improve teaching. Faculty were advised to be selective, to spotlight their achievements while retaining some balance. The centerpiece of the portfolio was to be a narrative of three to five pages describing the faculty member's teaching philosophy and goals as a teacher. Additional suggested guidelines included: (1) responding to and making changes based on negative scores and comments in student course evaluations; (2) measures being taken in the classroom to get feedback from students; (3) reflection on both the positive and the negative aspects of one's teaching experience; (4) evidence of working toward goals appropriate to one's discipline.

One way that faculty could demonstrate their commitment to teaching excellence was to track the progress of a course over two or more semesters while detailing adjustments made to improve teaching and learning effectiveness. In addition, faculty were advised to keep portfolio materials to a minimum and to present them, clearly tabbed, in a three-ring binder.

Early in 1992, the campus shifted its approach to encompass the suggestions made in AAHE's *The Teaching Portfolio* monograph that portfolios be structured around the "critical tasks" of teaching. This new model entailed case studies (or samples of work) demonstrating teaching achievement in four areas: course planning and preparation, actual teaching, evaluating student learning and providing feedback, and keeping up with the professional field in areas related to teaching performance.

Adopting the case (or sampling) approach has seemed to make sense to faculty, who have responded positively to the challenge of demonstrating their activities in these four areas. Guidelines now ask faculty to provide both a brief (one to two pages) essay explaining how they tackled a problem in each area, as well as documentation of their accomplishment — a syllabus, a corrected student paper, an exam, a letter from a colleague or supervisor, a chapter of a textbook. The end results have been generally clear, demonstrative, comparative, and entertaining to read.

Evaluation of Portfolios

The evaluation of teaching portfolios is the responsibility of the individual departments, schools, and colleges. No campus-wide evaluative criteria are in place at this time. As indicated above, the FTEP, which has been a key player in the development of portfolios, must distance itself from any summative evaluation efforts.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

To date, the administration is taking an evolutionary approach that is intended to allow individual faculty and departments to come to their own decisions as to the value of the teaching portfolio approach. While slower than a mandate, this strategy allows for thoughtful "buy-in" by the faculty and for discipline-related differences to develop.

Impact

Due to the newness of our portfolio assistance efforts, it is still too early to judge the impact they have had, although the portfolio appears to be developing as a de facto standard for faculty appointment, tenure, and promotion cases.

Those faculty who have completed their portfolios have expressed the following thoughts: (1) satisfaction at having the opportunity to celebrate and describe the unique aspects of their teaching; (2) surprise at the quantity and quality of their teaching achievements; (3) new understanding of themselves as teachers that they acquired while writing their personal narrative; and (4) determination to make further adjustments to their teaching in the future.

Next Steps

Plans are to maintain a focus on familiarizing new faculty members with teaching portfolios, pointing out the advantages of beginning a portfolio early in their careers. Outreach to department chairs also will continue, with an attempt, whenever possible, to provide input when departments are setting up standards for teaching portfolios.

Advice for Other Campuses

Start a "pilot" program in one department. Begin early by incorporating presentations and exercises about portfolio creation into programs for new-to-teaching and new-to-campus faculty. Have faculty focus on the personal narrative as an especially important component of the portfolio. Ask faculty to continue to document their growth as teachers and to update their portfolios as their careers progress.

Suggest to faculty that they keep the number of entries in their portfolios to a minimum, including only those entries that describe their most relevant and memorable teaching events.

Contact: Mary Ann Shea
Director, Faculty Teaching Excellence Program
Campus Box 360
University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, CO 80309-0360

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

The Institution

University of Maryland University College (UMUC), one of the eleven campuses of the University of Maryland system, is a unique institution established in 1947 to provide opportunities for adult education throughout Maryland and at numerous military installations in Europe and Asia. It is a multifaceted, self-sustaining institution serving more than 90,000 students annually in twenty-two countries.

Background

Since University of Maryland University College is primarily a teaching institution, professional-development opportunities are wide-ranging. The process of completing a teaching portfolio, which prompts reflection and subsequent improvements in teaching, relates directly to the college's mission of providing high-quality education to adult learners.

Because many faculty are encouraged to participate in the portfolio process, portfolios prepared by the "best and brightest" — the Excellence in Teaching Award recipients — provide positive examples for others to follow. Logistically and philosophically, asking nominees for the award to prepare their own portfolios addresses problems and yet offers opportunities. In the past, when Excellence in Teaching Award nominations totaled fewer than a dozen, compared with more than sixty today, the Faculty Development staff went to the nominees' teaching files and extracted evidence of good teaching (i.e., student evaluations, copies of peer evaluations, thank you letters for workshop attendance). These materials were duplicated *en mass* for the seven committee members. Each nominee was asked for direct input, including a statement of teaching philosophy, updated syllabi and exams, and comments about community service or outside activities related to teaching.

Now, letters are sent to nominees congratulating them on their nomination and inviting them to prepare a portfolio. Each nominee receives a packet, "Developing a Teaching Portfolio," with explanations and examples, plus several encouraging "how to" and "why" letters from the assistant dean of faculty development. They also receive duplicated teaching "evidence" from the teaching files maintained by the Office of Faculty Development to use as support material in appendices.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Faculty are encouraged to work in pairs, since they appear to be more productive in this arrangement; matches have happened spontaneously or have been arranged by the assistant dean. Some faculty prefer to work solo, aided by telephone consultations with the assistant dean of faculty development.

It is difficult to estimate how many people are in the process of preparing portfolios. Packets have been mailed and teaching files have been duplicated for approximately 100 faculty members. About twenty-five portfolios have been submitted to date, twenty of them to the Excellence in Teaching Award selection committee. Portfolios vary in content and quality. Activity is coordinated only by the assistant dean of faculty development, so faculty have to be fairly self-motivated to begin and complete the process.

A workshop also is offered once a year, entitled "Creating a Teaching Portfolio to Improve Teaching." Twenty-six people participated in the September 1991 session, and another workshop in October 1992 drew another dozen.

Portfolios have been used in the selection process for the Excellence in Teaching Award since 1987. Teacher-directed portfolios have been in use since 1991. There has been some discussion about requiring portfolios when faculty petition for an advancement, but currently they are not used for evaluation purposes. Most faculty say they prepare portfolios in order to document and reflect on their teaching practices. (One lecturer described his as a historical document that is always evolving.) At present, three faculty members have prepared portfolios for use when they interview elsewhere for teaching positions.

Portfolio Design and Contents

The portfolio packet, an accompanying letter that suggests various organizational strategies, and telephone consultations with the assistant dean provide focused, but not rigid guidance. Each nominee receives a list of the criteria considered by the Excellence in Teaching Award selection committee: nomination letter(s), statement of teaching philosophy, evidence of community service, participation in faculty-development activities, syllabi/exams, peer visits, student evaluations, grade distribution, and a recommendation from an assistant dean or program manager. This list invariably influences the formation of the portfolio.

Because of the diverse teaching faculty, most of whom are working professionals with academic degrees, "typical" portfolios are not seen or encouraged. In fact, the teaching portfolio packet deliberately includes two examples that vary considerably in content and tone. For example: A portfolio written by a computer science instructor contains impressive lists of teaching-improvement activities but does not provide much reflection; a portfolio prepared by a journalism instructor contains well-organized reflections with a more personal approach.

Evaluation of Portfolios

A rating form is used to help the selection committee focus on comparable factors. The 1991/1992 selection committee mentioned, however, that they would prefer a more systematic approach, with specified criteria of excellence, so that committee members would be certain to interpret data and weigh each component similarly. They also requested more uniformity in the content of the portfolios. When one finalist, for instance, did not include a summary of student evaluations, the committee asked for data from the teaching files to close this perceived gap.

There are hopes of standardizing the selection process before the next one occurs in March 1993. The selection criteria are openly shared, as are the accomplishments of the Excellence in Teaching Award recipients, but the specific deliberations of the committee remain confidential.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

Portfolio development appears to be spurred by the "kick-start" of the Excellence in Teaching Award; however, most faculty realize that the odds of their achieving recognition are relatively slim, given the large numbers of nominees. Many finalists devote time to the process of creating a teaching portfolio because they tend to be intrinsically motivated individuals who consider teaching an avocation.

Impact

At this point, no hard data link teaching portfolio preparation with teaching improvement and enhanced student learning outcomes. Because portfolios tend to be prepared by those faculty who are already committed to teaching excellence, incremental improvements would be difficult to measure. However, virtually all faculty members have commented that the process, while demanding and somewhat time-consuming, is worthwhile. They believe that the reflection results in improvements in their teaching. As one computer science lecturer commented, "It would be impossible to put together a portfolio and *not* think of ways to improve!"

Next Steps

The campus will definitely continue to use portfolios for the Excellence in Teaching Award with the hope of standardizing and systematizing the selection process. In the future, after the teaching portfolio is better known at UMUC, it may be required for faculty requesting salary increases.

Also, University of Maryland University College has teamed with University of Maryland College Park and Howard Community College to request funding from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) for a long-term collaborative, comparative research project on teaching portfolios. Because the missions and faculties of these campuses are so dissimilar, results are expected to be useful to other campuses.

Advice for Other Campuses

Advice to other campuses would be: (1) Provide encouragement and a great deal of follow-up. (2) Offer multiple examples, written explanations, and workshops. (3) Make the process valuable to faculty by giving them incentives or rewards for completing portfolios or by appealing to their commitment to teaching. (4) Make the process as painless as possible (i.e., reproduce materials from faculty files, if available). (5) Encourage faculty to work in pairs. (6) Get your "best and brightest" faculty involved so that others can follow their examples. (7) Involve chairs and specific departments. (8) Gain support from the top. (9) Tie portfolios directly into the reward system so that faculty have a vested interest in investing their time.

Materials Attached or Available

- The rating sheet used by the Excellence in Teaching Award committee is attached.
- Copies of the packet "Developing a Teaching Portfolio" are available by writing to the address below.

Contact: Barbara J. Millis
Assistant Dean, Faculty Development
University of Maryland University College
University Boulevard at Adelphi Road
College Park, MD 20742-1660

CONFIDENTIAL

TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARDS
COMMITTEE RATING SHEET

NAME OF LECTURER DISCIPLINE AREA:

Began Teaching with Maryland:

Name of committee member:

Please indicate with a circle around the appropriate number the relative strength of the supporting material found in the applicant's portfolio. Use the following scale:

4 = outstanding 3 = good 2 = adequate 1 = weak

In some cases, through no fault of the lecturer, material may be missing from a file, so please do not base any final decisions on a point total. Point totals are one indication among several.

Nomination letter(s):	1	2	3	4	material not in file
Lecturer's statement:	1	2	3	4	material not in file
Peer Visit:	1	2	3	4	material not in file
Syllabi/Exams:	1	2	3	4	material not in file
Student evaluations:	1	2	3	4	material not in file
Asst. Dean or Program manager recommendation:	1	2	3	4	material not in file
Participation in Fac. Dev. activities and/or workshops:	1	2	3	4	material not in file
Evidence of community service:	1	2	3	4	material not in file
Grade Distribution:	1	2	3	4	material not in file
Other (Please Comment):	1	2	3	4	
OVERALL RECOMMENDATION:	1	2	3	4	

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA-TWIN CITIES

The Institution

Located in the Twin Cities, the University of Minnesota enrolls almost 40,000 students. Approximately 9,000 students each year take courses in the writing program (the focus of this entry).

Background

In the past decade, attention in composition studies has turned from abstract models to a study of actual teacher practice; recent research looks at teachers' own stories and struggles in their own classrooms. To advance this work, the Alliance for Undergraduate Education, a group of sixteen public research universities, has initiated a project on teaching portfolios designed to capture composition teachers' stories and actual practice. The University of Minnesota now has launched such a project in its writing program. Several other Alliance institutions may join the university in this project in the future.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

The project is in an early, pilot phase, involving several dozen teaching assistants from a variety of disciplines, all teaching in the freshman composition program. The design is longitudinal, intended to cover a typical six-year TA appointment, both to study and to promote growth over that period.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Guidelines distinguish between primary and secondary documents. Primary documents are those produced in the act of teaching: syllabi, assignments, student work samples, examinations. Secondary documents are those that reflect on primary documents: peer-observation reports, teaching journals, goal and philosophy statements. Documents of both types are required as evidence related to a developmental sequence of teaching issues to be addressed over the six years the portfolio is kept. For example, portfolios might move from relatively basic issues of course and assignment design in Year I, to more advanced issues of teaching innovation in the final year, as follows: Year I entries focus on course and assignment design; Year II on evaluation of student work; Year III on teaching style; Year IV on composition theory; Year V on innovation; Year VI on the preparation of a professional portfolio for a job search.

TAs in the first and final years of this six-year model now are constructing portfolios; TAs in interim years will be phased in over time. Portfolios for first-year TAs, focused on course and assignment design, include: (1) a syllabus, plus a detailed rationale statement; (2) one fully articulated assignment given in class, plus the TA's responses to sample strong and weak papers written for that assignment, plus overall reflection on the assignment's effectiveness; (3) a peer-observation report and reflection on it; (4) post-course reflection on student evaluations; (5) selected responses to scenarios from *Scenarios for Teaching Writing: Contexts for Discussion and Reflective Practice* (see Bibliography), a set of materials from an earlier project of the Alliance working group on writing instruction and assessment.

Evaluation of Portfolios

The primary purpose of teaching portfolios in the context described here is development and improvement, as well as professional preparation for academic positions beyond graduate school. However, the program director intends to use the portfolio as a resource in cases when it might be necessary to evaluate aspects of the program and its overall performance.

Next Steps

Additional TAs will be phased into the portfolio project, and models for Years II, III, and IV will be fleshed out. The project director also is working with participants to design "interventions," which stop short of "evaluation" but make the portfolio a more-powerful learning experience.

Materials Attached or Available

- For further information about the use of portfolios to prompt reflective practice among writing teachers, see "The Teaching Portfolio: Writing Our Way to Reflective Practice" (see Bibliography).
- For prompts for portfolio entries, see the collection of cases *Scenarios for Teaching Writing: Contexts for Discussion and Reflective Practice*, by C.M. Anson, et al. (Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English/Alliance for Undergraduate Education, in press).

Contact: Chris Anson
Director, Program in Composition
306 Lind Hall
The University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455
fax: 612/626-2294
e-mail: UMCOMP@STAFF.TC.UMN.EDU

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN

The Institution

Close to 25,000 students attend the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, a land-grant, AAU institution offering undergraduate and graduate degrees in a wide variety of disciplines.

Background

The campus was looking for a more complete and widely acceptable way of documenting teaching, especially in light of the widespread view that student evaluations alone were an unreliable method of assessment. Teaching portfolios offered a vehicle for documenting teaching in a new and better way, a way of distinguishing teachers and teaching styles so that colleagues could better collaborate and share insights.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Teaching portfolios have been used on campus since 1990, although other forms of documentation have been in general use since 1973. A FIPSE project on the evaluation and reward of teaching has prompted faculty in five colleges and twenty-eight departments, mostly in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, to begin using other sources of documentation in addition to student evaluations, with some programs moving toward portfolios or portfolio-like documentation. These departments employ upwards of 800 teaching faculty.

Faculty members usually develop portfolios on their own, although collaboration occurs in a few departments. Department chairs request and evaluate portfolios, and meet with faculty for annual review. Other groups on campus play roles in portfolio development: Students provide evaluative feedback and the Teaching and Learning Center provides support in the form of a newsletter, workshops, consultants, and printed resources.

Motivation for portfolio use varies. Merit increases and special teaching awards are most heavily based on portfolios. Portfolios are reviewed annually for nontenured faculty, and on a three-year cycle for candidates for promotion. Merit increases for good teaching are given to those faculty whose portfolios contain sufficient evidence, while other faculty are denied raises by some chairs when documentation is missing. Not all chairs are vigorous in pressing for documentation.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Guidelines for development and content of portfolios vary greatly in different departments, but generally they aim at including a variety of data sources: student, peer, and self-evaluations; exams; syllabi; student work; exemplary assignments; and a description of future goals. Portfolios vary in structure and content by department. The Psychology Department has produced a "Teaching Effort Evaluation Summary Sheet" (attached) that lists suggested portfolio items.

Evaluation of Portfolios

The evaluation process varies according to department. In some departments (e.g., Industrial Engineering) it is the chair who reads and reviews them; in other departments (e.g., English)

a subcommittee evaluates and makes recommendations to the chair, who makes the final decision.

Scoring of portfolios also varies according to department. Some departments assign points according to different categories (e.g., Agricultural Communications), while others assign a general or "global" score (e.g., Art and Art History). The Mathematics Department assigns separate scores to classroom and nonclassroom teaching. All in all, scoring depends most heavily on student evaluations. Each department has its own evaluation sheet (see the sample sheets attached).

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

Some faculty, particularly in some science departments, resist the greater focus on teaching. Some also resist the requirement that candidates for a tenure-leading position give a teaching demonstration, a practice that is increasingly insisted upon by the deans.

Impact

As a result of portfolio use, criteria for teaching awards and merit pay have been adjusted in some departments and colleges. Most important, survey results from departments that have used portfolios for at least two years show that those faculty have more confidence that teaching is being taken seriously.

Next Steps

It is not easy for inexperienced readers of portfolios to know how to evaluate them. This campus needs to train members of the executive committees and personnel committees, as well as department chairs, to evaluate portfolios. This is not an easy task, since most evaluators generally are satisfied with their customary methods.

Also needed is increased assistance and collaboration among faculty and administrators in compiling portfolios.

Advice for Other Campuses

Ask how portfolios can be used to improve teaching as well as to document it. Continuous pressure from many sources is needed to keep portfolio development on track. Have small sessions on portfolios involving faculty, departmental chairs, and a person with experience in evaluating portfolios. Set up incentives for use within the departments.

Materials Attached or Available

- Rating and evaluation sheets from several departments are attached, as is the Psychology Department's "Teaching Effort Evaluation Summary Sheet."

Contact: Robert Narveson
Professor of English
113 Andrews Hall
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68588-0333

PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Complete a copy of this sheet for each course taught.

Teaching Effort and Evaluation Summary Sheet

Course, Lab, Recl, or Supervision _____ Semester _____ Year _____

Load (circle one) new "course" old "course"

Below is a checklist of suggested materials. Please indicate which you have included.

____ syllabi

____ assignments (with "keys" of correct answers)

____ term papers (description of objectives and length)

____ quizzes/tests (descriptions of nature and number)

____ summaries of ratings and comments from student course evaluations

____ formal self-evaluations (e.g. self-analysis checklists)

____ peer-evaluations (e.g. classroom observations and/or evaluations from teaching circles)

____ other student-based evaluations (e.g. classroom environment assessment)

1. (For old courses) Description of modifications in goals, materials, assignments, tests, evaluations, etc.

2. Help resources provided for students (e.g., old exams, papers, lectures)

3. Nature of performance feedback given to students.

4. Evaluation of modifications and/or informal research (what worked, what will you change, how did your results influence you?)

5. Other features of teaching

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines
Cumulative Scores For Teaching and Learning

Department of Agricultural Education

Evaluation Components	Points Possible	Points Earned
Student Evaluation and Written Faculty Responses.....	40	
Annual and Long Term Objectives for Teaching.....	5	
Self-Evaluation Report.....	5	
Creative/Scholarly Activities In Teaching and Learning.....	20	
Professional Development In Teaching and Learning.....	10	
Course Outlines, Objectives, And Evaluation Policies.....	10	
Peer Review and Classroom Observation.....	10	
TOTAL	100	
Percentage (Points Earned/Points Possible)		

To arrive at the contribution of teaching to the overall evaluation score for a particular faculty member, multiply the percentage calculated above times the percent teaching in the position description.

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

Preliminary merit recommendation for _____, CY 1990
(Caution: Ratings to one decimal place only.)

NOTES

Teaching:

Research:

Service:

PRELIMINARY RATING

CLASSROOM TEACHING	NON-CLASS TEACHING & ADVISING	TEACHING OVERALL	RESEARCH	SERVICE

CURRENT-YEAR ALLOCATION OF EFFORT:

Teaching: _____ Research: _____ Service: _____

*PRELIMINARY CALCULATED RATING: ☐ PRELIMINARY HOLISTIC RATING: ☐

*To obtain calculated rating, multiply the overall teaching rating by the allocation to teaching, the research rating by the allocation to research, and the service rating by the allocation to service. Add the three figures, keeping two decimal places.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, GREENSBURG CAMPUS

The Institution

Greensburg is one of four regional campuses affiliated with the University of Pittsburgh, an independent, nonsectarian institution. Approximately 1,500 students pursue associate and baccalaureate degrees on the Greensburg campus.

Background

The central mission of the University of Pittsburgh, Greensburg Campus (UPG) is teaching. While focused in large part on teaching, UPG portfolios (which are called "dossiers") also encompass professional development and service to the university and community. They have been in use for many years for a variety of formative and summative purposes. A committee now is examining portfolio practices, seeking to ensure greater campus-wide consistency.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

UPG faculty in all departments and divisions are required to maintain portfolios, which are used for end-of-year evaluations, reappointment, and promotion and tenure decisions. University-wide teacher excellence awards also have been determined on the basis of portfolios for a number of years. While portfolios have been used at UPG for many years, the portfolio process has become much more formal in the last two. Their more effective use is part of a larger effort to move toward systematic peer review of teaching, the subject of a recent *ad hoc* committee report.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Portfolio-development guidelines list a number of possible items for inclusion: statements of teaching roles, responsibilities, and goals; representative course materials (including syllabi, course descriptions, assignments, exams and quizzes, handouts, lecture outlines, and other materials); materials that show the extent of student learning; evaluations by students, faculty peers, and administrators; course- and curriculum-development documents; and information regarding efforts to improve teaching. Guidelines are meant to be flexible and suggestive; there is no "standard" portfolio.

Evaluation of Portfolios

Evaluation criteria depend on the setting and purpose (e.g., whether the portfolio is being used for a standard end-of-year review or a decision about tenure). A committee currently is reviewing the portfolio-evaluation process, looking at issues of fairness and consistency across the campus; new criteria are being developed.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

Diversity must be respected to avoid forcing many differently shaped pegs into the same hole. In a given year, a faculty member may do extensive course development but perform limited scholarship or campus service; over a period of years, however, a balanced picture should emerge. Or, temperament or the demands of their discipline may lead different faculty members to

straight lecturing or Socratic dialogue or group projects or team-teaching. Again, the intent is to evaluate faculty within the context of the approach taken and goals pursued, which can vary widely.

Impact

Portfolios have been used primarily for summative evaluation, rather than for formative, developmental purposes. Thus, direct impact on teaching is questionable.

Next Steps

A next step will be to place more emphasis on the power of portfolios to improve teaching. UPG now is developing a campus teaching excellence award; the portfolio will play a large role in that selection process. In general, ways are being sought to put greater emphasis on the teaching-improvement aspect of portfolios. This means finding ways for portfolio review to give faculty both positive and negative feedback in a constructive manner. It means linking portfolio use to other teaching-improvement strategies, such as a newly devised process of peer review/classroom visitation.

Materials Attached or Available

- The attached materials include the first three pages of the guidelines for documenting teaching, advising, professional development, and service ("Dossier Materials"), and materials on peer review.

Contact: Donald R. Reilly
Professor of English
FOB 219
University of Pittsburgh, Greensburg Campus
Greensburg, PA 15601

DOSSIER MATERIALS

The following material delineates items that might be included in a dossier to document performance in the areas of teaching, advising, professional development, and service. **The items included in each category are not meant to be a simple checklist, nor are the listings intended to be exhaustive. Obviously, some activities will require a greater commitment of time and effort than others and should be weighted accordingly.** For example, presenting a paper at a conference is usually a greater contribution to professional development than simply attending a conference.

Within each category, performance will be judged both on breadth of activities and on quality of specific activities. Consideration is given to all of the activities related to a given project. For example, faculty members who are seeking external funding for a teaching, research, or service project should be recognized for preparation of the grant proposal, receipt of the grant, and execution of the project. Similarly, faculty members should receive consideration for the preparation, presentation, and publication of manuscripts. Professional development at UPC is often related to course and curriculum development. Accordingly, while course and curriculum development are categorized as teaching, a range of teaching-related activities are categorized within professional development, including presentation and publication related to teaching.

ITEMS THAT MIGHT BE INCLUDED IN A DOSSIER TO DOCUMENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE

1. Roles, Responsibilities, and Goals

   - A statement of teaching roles and responsibilities
   - A reflective statement of teaching goals and approaches
   - A list of courses taught, with enrollments and brief descriptions

2. Representative Course Materials

   - Syllabi
   - Course descriptions with details of content, objectives, methods, and procedures for evaluating student learning
   - Reading lists
   - Assignments
   - Exams and quizzes, graded and ungraded
   - Handouts, problem sets, lecture outlines
   - Descriptions and examples of audiovisual material used
   - Descriptions of computer usage or other technology in teaching

3. Materials Showing Extent of Student Learning

- Scores on standardized or other test, before and after instruction
- Students' lab books, or other workbooks
- Students' papers, essays, or creative works
- Graded work from the best and poorest students with instructor's feedback to students
- Instructor's written feedback on student work

4. Evaluation of Teaching

- Summarized student evaluations of teaching, including response rate, students' written comments, and overall ratings
- Letters from students, preferably unsolicited
- Comments from a peer observer or colleague
- Letter from division chairperson
- Summative evaluation reports

5. Course and Curriculum Development

- Design of new courses
- Design of interdisciplinary or collaborative courses or teaching projects
- Work on curriculum revision or development
- Obtaining funds or equipment for teaching labs or programs
- Development of student assistantship or internship program

6. Activities to Improve Instruction

- Use of new methods of teaching, assessing learning, grading
- Use of innovative audiovisual materials or computer-assisted learning
- Description of instructional improvement projects developed or implemented
- Assistance to colleagues on teaching

7. Honors or Awards

- Teaching award from department / school / university
- Teaching award from profession
- Other teaching awards

8. Miscellaneous Sources on Teaching Effectiveness

- Comments from students' parents or employers
- Statements from colleagues in the department or elsewhere re preparation of students for advanced work or employment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ITEMS THAT MIGHT BE INCLUDED IN A DOSSIER TO DOCUMENT ADVISING PERFORMANCE

1. Activities Related to Academic Counseling

2. Activities Related to Academic Registration

   Number and description of advisees
   Participation in summer registration

3. Activities Related to Career Counseling

   Assistance with undergraduate program
   Assistance with planning for employment or graduate school

4. Referral to Other University Services

5. Description of Advising Responsibilities and Procedures

6. A Statement of Advising Goals and Approaches

7. Advising Materials Developed for Students

8. Meetings or Projects Related to Advising (e.g., general meeting for majors)

PEER REVIEW

(at the time of third year reappointment decisions and/or
promotion to Assistant Professor)

(1) The Divisional Chairperson, in consultation with the candidate, should choose two or three tenured peer reviewers from the UPG faculty or from outside in the event that there are not a sufficient number of UPG faculty in the same or in cognate disciplines. The Divisional Chairperson has final authority for the selection of peer reviewers.

(2) The peer reviewers should examine the candidate's dossier with respect to all aspects of performance--teaching, professional development, and service.

(3) The peer reviewers should submit a detailed and thorough report (either collectively or individually) to the Divisional Chairperson which addresses all aspects of the candidate's performance (teaching, professional development, service) to date and potential in the years ahead. The peer reviewers should be careful to reference the data (material in the dossier) on which their conclusions are based. The peer reviewers, in effect, are being asked to render a judgment based on the dossier presented to them, and to justify that judgment by reference to the dossier.

(4) Based on the peer report(s) of the reviewers and the annual reviews, the Divisional Chairperson is to make a recommendation to the Dean of Academic Affairs. Again, this recommendation must be with full justification by reference to the annual reviews and the peer report(s) of the reviewers as well as to the dossier materials.

(5) In order to provide adequate feedback to the candidate, the Divisional Chairperson should meet with the candidate to share the substance of the review and his/her own recommendation. A written summary should be provided to the candidate. Care should be taken not to associate specific comments with particular peer reviewers; however, the candidate should be left with a clear picture of his/her perceived strengths and weaknesses.

Attached is a form which can be used as a guide in evaluating the teaching component of the dossier. Peer reviewers are not required to use the form, but they are clearly expected to focus on and make judgments about similar kinds of things. If the form is utilized, then the peer reviewers should attach additional pages to provide an adequate commentary.

SUGGESTED FORM FOR PEER REVIEW OF UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING BASED ON DOSSIER MATERIALS

QUESTION	DOSSIER MATERIALS	SUGGESTED FOCUS IN EXAMINING DOSSIER MATERIALS
1. What is the quality of materials used in teaching?	Course outline Syllabus Reading list Text used Study guide Description of non-print materials Hand-outs Problem sets Assignments	Are these materials current? Do they represent the best work in the field? Are they adequate and appropriate to course goals? Do they represent superficial or thorough coverage of course content?
Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very High Comments _____		
2. What kind of intellectual tasks were set by the teacher for the students (or did the teacher succeed in getting students to set for themselves), and how did the students perform?	Copies of graded examinations Examples of graded research papers Examples of teacher's feedback to students on written work Grade distribution Descriptions of student performances, e.g., class presentation, etc. Examples of completed assignments	What was the level of intellectual performance achieved by the students? What kind of work was given an A? a B? a C? Did the students learn what the department curriculum expected for this course? How adequately do the tests or assignments represent the kinds of student performance specified in the course objectives?
Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very High Comments _____		
3. How knowledgeable is this faculty member in subjects taught?	Evidence in teaching materials Record of attendance at regional or national meetings Record of colloquia or lectures given	Has the instructor kept in thoughtful contact with developments in his or her field? Is there evidence of acquaintance with the ideas and findings of other scholars? (This question addresses the scholarship necessary to good teaching. It is *not* concerned with scholarly research publication.)
Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very High Comments _____		
4. Has this faculty member assumed responsibilities related to the department's or University's teaching mission?	Record of service on department curriculum committee, honors program, advising board of teaching support service, special committees (e.g., to examine grading policies, admission standards, etc.) Description of activities in supervising graduate students learning to teach. Evidence of design of new courses	Has he or she become a departmental or college citizen in regard to teaching responsibilities? Does this faculty member recognize problems that hinder good teaching and does he or she take a responsible part in trying to solve them? Is the involvement of the faculty member appropriate to his or her academic level? (e.g., assistant professors may sometimes become overinvolved to the detriment of their scholarly and teaching activities.)
Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very High Comments _____		
5. To what extent is this faculty member trying to achieve excellence in teaching?	Factual statement of what activities the faculty member has engaged in to improve his or her teaching. Examples of questionnaires used for formative purposes. Examples of changes made on the basis of feedback.	Has he or she sought feedback about teaching quality, explored alternative teaching methods, made changes to increase student learning? Has he or she sought aid in trying new teaching ideas? Has he or she developed special teaching materials or participated in cooperative efforts aimed at upgrading teaching quality?
Peer Reviewer's Rating: Low ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Very High Comments _____		

G.F. LAZOVIK, 1979
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Peer Reviewer's Signature _____

Date _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

The Institution

The La Crosse campus is one of thirteen universities and thirteen centers granting the associate degree that constitute the University of Wisconsin system. UW-La Crosse enrolls about 8,800 students pursuing associate, baccalaureate, and selected master's degrees.

Background

Teaching portfolios currently are being explored across the University of Wisconsin system as a way of raising the level of attention to teaching and improving its quality. Several system-wide workshops on portfolio development have taken place; steps toward implementation have begun on some individual campuses, including UW-La Crosse, where activities designed to increase awareness and use of portfolios are under way. Teaching portfolios are expected to play a part in the recently modified process for evaluating teaching and in a new procedure for post-tenure review; they also are being piloted as a possible tool (among a number) for assessing the La Crosse general-education program.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Current use of teaching portfolios is minimal, but faculty awareness and interest appear to be on the rise. During the summer of 1992, with leadership from the Center for Effective Teaching and Learning, a Teaching Portfolio Study Group of ten to twenty faculty met five times to discuss types and uses of portfolios; an additional seventy faculty who could not attend the study group requested materials from it. Building on that effort, a seminar for faculty interested in learning about and assembling portfolios was offered during Fall 1992. In Spring 1993, the General Education Committee will ask faculty volunteers to assemble teaching portfolios focused on the general-education courses they teach. These efforts are designed to raise awareness of portfolios and to move toward implementation in a thoughtful way.

In short, portfolios have not yet been integrated into or linked to any formal reward structure. But many faculty are interested in improving their teaching and in finding better ways to document it (there is considerable dissatisfaction with the practices currently used in merit, promotion, and tenure decisions), and they see portfolios as a better way.

Portfolio Design and Contents

As yet, no standard guidelines for portfolio development exist. However, one model being explored is the "course portfolio," which focuses on a single course and includes (1) a statement indicating the relationship between the professor's teaching goals and his or her instructional practices; (2) the course syllabus; (3) examples of key assignments and learning activities; (4) samples or summaries of student work; (5) student feedback on teaching and learning in the course; and (6) a self-assessment statement that summarizes strengths, areas needing improvement, additional goals, or possible changes for the subsequent teaching of the course. The aim of this "course portfolio" model, proposed by William Cerbin, director of the Center for Effective Teaching and Learning, is to more fully represent the scholarship of teaching discussed in the 1992 Carnegie report *Scholarship Reconsidered*; it is intended as one of several portfolio models

for eventual implementation on the UW-La Crosse campus.

Evaluation of Portfolios

The only evaluation that has occurred thus far has been in the study group and seminar settings described above, where the group gave feedback to individuals who wanted help with their portfolios.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

An obvious obstacle to the development and use of teaching portfolios (like any new thing) is that people are busy and need to see the benefits before they take on "more work." A particularly powerful argument for portfolios at UW-La Crosse has turned out to be the process of developing them. For example, a sociology professor brought a four-page draft of a portfolio entry to the Teaching Portfolio Study Group for feedback; the ensuing discussion was less about the portfolio *per se* than about the teaching represented in the draft entry, which was the subject of a lengthy, productive conversation that both the group and the individual found very interesting. Cerbin himself described the process of developing his portfolio as "the single most interesting and valuable course-revision activity in my twelve years of teaching at this institution."

Impact

Individuals have found the portfolio process valuable, but it is too early to evaluate more widespread impact.

Next Steps

For portfolios to become widespread and to be used to their full potential, they need to be linked to the reward structure and to decisions that people care about. Steps in this direction entail (1) activities by pilot departments charged with providing models of portfolio use for others on campuses; (2) further discussion by the promotion committee of university-wide use of portfolios; and (3) the use of "course portfolios" to assess general-education goals. Also, under the auspices of the Center for Effective Teaching and Learning, attempts are being made to develop a model of the portfolio that reflects the *improvement* of teaching, the aim being to make improvement an important criterion for merit, tenure, and promotion.

Materials Attached or Available

- Attached are handouts prepared for UW-La Crosse faculty, including a general description of teaching portfolios ("Teaching Portfolios as Tools for Assessment").
- Also attached is one entry from a course portfolio developed by William Cerbin aimed at documenting reflective practice ("A Learning-Centered Course Portfolio for Educational Psychology").
- For a further account of work with portfolios at UW-La Crosse, see "Using Course Portfolios to Enhance Teaching and Learning," by William Cerbin, presented at the 12th Annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

Contact: William Cerbin
Professor of Psychology and Director, Center for Effective Teaching and Learning
335 B Main Hall
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
La Crosse, WI 54601

Teaching Portfolios As Tools For Assessment

What is a teaching portfolio? A portfolio or dossier is a collection of material that depicts the nature and quality of an individual's teaching and students' learning. Portfolios are structured deliberately to reflect particular aspects of teaching and learning--they are not trunks full of teaching artifacts and memorabilia. At its best a portfolio documents an instructor's approach to teaching, combining specific evidence of instructional strategies and effectiveness in a way that captures teaching's intellectual substance and complexity.

Why should we bother with portfolios? Exemplary teaching is complex, creative and intellectually challenging. Good teaching involves invention, problem solving, knowledge worrying, assessment and revision. Teachers confront a myriad of problems on a daily basis such as how to help students understand particularly complex material, or how to improve their ability to reason and think critically, or how to engender commitment to learning goals among disinterested students, or how to help students overcome their fear of a subject, and so on. Good teaching is a scholarly endeavor, and we need better ways to define, capture, document, and assess the scholarship in teaching. Most methods of teaching evaluation are based on underdeveloped conceptions of teaching and assess only fragments of what really takes place in teaching.

The teaching portfolio is a tool that can be used to represent more fully the complexity of teaching and learning. Portfolios can be used both to assist in the development of good teaching (formative assessment) and as a basis for evaluating teaching performance (summative assessment).

What do portfolios look like? There is no standardized format for portfolios. The contents and structure should follow from the purposes and audiences for the portfolio. Below are three different formats for structuring portfolios.

I. General Portfolio- Seldin in The Teaching Portfolio recommends that a portfolio contain material from three different sources.
   A. Self- syllabi, examinations, reflective statements of teaching philosophy and strategies
   B. Others- results of student and peer evaluations, documentation of awards or recognition
   C. Products- examples of students' performance, essays, tests.

II. Core Task Portfolio- Lee Shulman at Stanford (reported in The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching by Edgerton, Hutchings and Quinlan), who has used portfolios to study exemplary teachers, recommends including material related to four "core tasks."
   A. course planning and preparation
   B. actual teaching
   C. evaluation of students' learning and providing feedback
   D. keeping up in the professional field related to teaching performance

III. Course Portfolio- Cerbin recommends structuring portfolios around a single course, documenting the goals, methods, and results of teaching and learning. The elements include:
   A. Teaching statement- An explanation of the relationship between learning goals and teaching methods
   B. Syllabus and key assignments
   C. Examples of students' learning on key assignments
   D. Summary of student feedback collected during the course-not just at the end
   E. Summary of extent to which the instructor and students attained the course objectives, and a discussion of what specific areas need addtional improvement.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What are some ways to use teaching portfolios? Portfolios can be used both for formative and summative assessment of teaching. Portfolios could be used to

1. Mentor new faculty- Portfolios could help focus the mentoring process on teaching improvement. New teachers might assemble portfolios and use these in mentoring sessions with experienced faculty members. Departments might ask senior faculty to assemble portfolios as examples for new faculty.
2. Post-tenure review- Portfolios offer an interesting opportunity to organize and structure such a review in a meaningful way that focuses on continued teaching development.
3. Selection of new faculty members- Do you really get good information about teaching performance from job applicants? How about asking the final candidates for a portfolio?
4. Colloquium on teaching- If portfolios really capture the scholarship in teaching then they might serve as a basis for teaching colloquia in departments. Faculty members might select a portion of their material for presentation to colleagues or as a brain storming session to think about persistent teaching problems or issues.
5. Basis for departmental discussions about standards, expectations, criteria for good teaching- Few academic departments have explicit and well developed standards for teaching or criteria that characterize models of good teaching within the discipline. Teaching portfolios could be used to foster discussion within departments that eventually might produce more coherent ideas about good teaching.
6. Teaching awards- Portfolios can be used to evaluate teaching for awards.
7. Job search- A portfolio can be an important addition to a vita and lists of publications.

The best reason to use portfolios. Portfolios are a way to structure self-evaluation and to reflect systematically on how students learn in relation to the ways we teach. I assume that most good teachers monitor and evaluate themselves on a regular basis. I also know from personal experience that this tends to be involve casual reflection. In my own case I develop impressions of how things have gone in class, and then with good intentions plan to change or fix things in the future. Of course, the future never arrives. A portfolio approach provides a more coherent way to examine and enhance teaching and learning. The real payoffs are personal--in terms of insight into ones own performance and development as a teacher. It is one of the best ways I know to help teachers understand the complex nature of what they do, why they do it and how they might want to change it.

References

Cerbin, W. (1992). How to improve teaching with learning-centered evaluation. *The national teaching and learning forum.* 1, (6). pp. 8-9.

Edgerton, R. Hutchings, P. & Quinlan, P. (1991). *The teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship in teaching.* Washington, D.C. American Association of Higher Education.

Seldin, P. (1991). *The teaching portfolio* Bolton, MA. Anker Publishing Co.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Case for Course Portfolios

I argue that we should construe individual courses as pieces of scholarship--comparable to conventional research/scholarship. An entire course is a kind of conceptual entity in which teachers integrate content and teaching practices to accomplish specific aims in a specific time period. This entails planning and preparation, development of goals, actual teaching, experimenting with new teaching practices and material, and revising elements to enhance students' learning, thinking and development.

A course portfolio contains material that documents the nature and quality of teaching and learning in one course--reflecting the range and scope of the course, the goals, methods and outcomes. The specific contents include:

1. A "Teaching Statement" that explains what the instructor wants to accomplish and how his or her teaching is intended to bring this about. The statement explains the relationship between intended outcomes and teaching practices.
2. A course syllabus as an example of the primary nature of the course as explained to students.
3. A copy of key assignments and learning activities. Two or three assignments are sufficient to represent the types of academic work students engage in during the course. The assignments should address one or more of the course goals in substantive ways.
4. Examples or summaries of students' performance on the key assignments.
5. Summary of student perceptions of teaching and learning collected during the semester.
6. A self-assessment, that summarizes the extent to which students attained the course objectives, and students' perceptions of their experience, and given the outcomes, what the instructor might do differently next time.

Benefits of course portfolios. The course portfolio is comparable to a manuscript of a scholarly work in progress--in this case a manuscript that explains the nature and quality of teaching and learning in one course. It affords a specific context for self-review. As teachers compose teaching statements, they examine their assumptions and beliefs about the connections between teaching and learning and try to square them with their classroom practices. As courses proceed, teachers examine students' coursework and perceptions of the class in relation to course goals. And, the instructor's summary explains how things turned out--what worked well, what did not, what should be changed and how that might be done.

Coherent course portfolios are easier to analyze and evaluate than a collection of teaching artifacts, and therefore a useful tool for peer review. In particular, the teaching statement creates a conceptual framework that helps colleagues understand what the instructor intentions, goals and teaching practices. Moreover, the self-assessment provides a concise summary of how it all turned out. Collective analyses of portfolios provide a specific context in which to examine and evaluate teaching, and may help colleagues develop ideas about how to enhance teaching and establish appropriate criteria and standards for judging teaching quality.

Students participate as informed and significant partners in formative assessment. Their perceptions and interpretations of teaching and learning throughout the course are based in an understanding of the instructor's rationale for the goals, methods and assignments in the course. In contrast, traditional approaches benefit neither the students nor instructors. Since instructor rating forms tend to focus on generic dimensions of teaching (e.g., organization and enthusiasm) rather than the specific interplay between teaching and learning in the course, the information tends to be of little value to the teacher.

B. CERBIN, UW-LA CROSSE-TP OVERVIEW FS 92

A LEARNING-CENTERED COURSE PORTFOLIO FOR EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Bill Cerbin

Center For Effective Teaching and Learning
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

Fall, 1992

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Course Portfolio Entries

Teaching Statement 2

Assessment of Small Group Learning Activity 6

Assessment of Students' Learning Using Discussion Assignments and A Culminating Essay 8

Students' Self-assessment and Their Assessment of Teaching 10

Assessment of Authentic Writing Projects 12

Results of course/instructor evaluation 13

Course Summary 14

Appendix

Guidelines for Participating Effectively in Group Discussions 19

Discussion Evaluation Form 21

Discussion Assignment and Culminating Essay 22

Feedback on Culminating Essay 23

Assessment of Learning and Teaching 25

Authentic Writing Project 27

Peer Review Guidelines 28

Introduction

I developed this portfolio to help me understand, document, assess and enhance teaching and learning in a course I taught in fall, 1992. It represents one version of what a course portfolio can look like and what it can do to enhance teaching and learning. The course portfolio is founded upon two central ideas. The first is that the primary aim of teaching is to enhance students' learning, thinking and development. Teaching and learning are interdependent endeavors, and to me it makes no sense to examine one without examining the other. Therefore I have tried to make this a "learning-centered" portfolio. The second idea is that a single course is an ideal context in which to explore relationships between teaching and learning. Courses represent coherent entities in which teachers integrate content and teaching practices to accomplish specific aims within a particular time period.

A course portfolio creates a coherent view of teaching and learning throughout an entire course. It explains what the instructor intends to accomplish with students, how the teacher uses various teaching practices to address these aims and the results of the experience in terms of students' learning, thinking and development. Portfolios provide a way to document the substance and complexity of teaching in a course, and can be used to structure self-assessment as well as peer review. The course portfolio can also be used to document and assess students' learning and thinking, and development.

The key elements of a course portfolio include:

1. Teaching Statement. A teaching statement describes learning goals and teaching practices and presents a substantive rationale for the goals and the methods in the course. Ideally, the statement explains what the professor hopes to accomplish and why, and how the professor intends to accomplish it and why. The statement establishes a conceptual framework that connects a teacher's intentions to actual practice and students' learning.
2. Key assignments or learning activities. The portfolio includes several assignments that address important learning goals and represent the types of work students do in the course.
3. Students' performance on the key assignments. The portfolio includes evidence of students' learning and thinking, either examples or summaries of students' work. Ideally these should represent qualitative differences among students' learning and thinking. For instance, one might select several examples of particularly strong and weak work on an assignment. Or, the teacher might summarize students' work on an assignment by grouping it into broad categories that reflect important differences in the quality of learning and thinking.
4. Student perceptions of teaching and learning. A course portfolio includes student feedback about their experiences in the course. Students' observations and interpretations add a critical dimension to course portfolios, and involves students in shaping the quality of teaching and learning in the class.
5. Course summary. The course summary explains the extent to which students attained the course objectives, and discusses what worked well and what could be done to improve teaching and learning in the course. It is based upon the teacher's analysis of the portfolio material collected over the semester.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Assessment of Small Group Learning Activity

This entry explains teaching and learning in one class period in October, 1992. I explain what I did, why I did it, how it turned out, and what I might do to improve students' learning in the future.

Background. There are 38 students in the class; most are junior or senior teacher education majors. The session took place during a point in the semester when we were studying the general topics of learning and thinking. My major goal for the unit is to improve students' ability to explain how teaching affects cognition (i.e., learning and thinking). I want my students to have a sound grasp of how people learn and think, and to be able to explain how teaching practices influence how students learn and think. This ability, I believe, is an essential foundation for good teaching.

What I did and why. My goal in this learning activity was to have students explore the connections between teaching and learning, and explain from a cognitive perspective how teaching affects the ways that students learn and think. We had spent two prior class periods examining a general model of learning and thinking, and students had already read a number of articles and chapters on the subject. Their previous discussion assignments indicated that they had a good grasp of the major concepts and mental processes involved in learning and thinking. The class session consisted of four parts.

1. During the first 25-30 minutes I described reciprocal teaching, an interactive teaching approach designed to enhance reading comprehension. RT has been well-researched and is an extremely effective way to get non-comprehenders to develop strategies that improve their understanding and memory of text.
2. Following my description of RT, I asked students to work in small groups and explain why reciprocal teaching has such a strong effect on comprehension. I made it clear that they should incorporate the cognitive concepts that we had developed in previous class sessions into their explanations. They worked for about 45 minutes, and each group completed a summary of their explanations.
3. In the remaining 10-15 minutes, I led a class discussion to compare the groups' ideas. I wrote their explanations on the board, asked for clarification, orchestrated comments and reactions among the groups, and in some cases challenged the ideas in an attempt to sharpen their reasoning.
4. At the end of class I asked students to fill out a Discussion Evaluation Form (See appendix page 19)

How it turned out. There are two sources of information about students' learning experiences. First, the groups' summaries provide a direct measure of students' learning and thinking related to the activity. Second, students' evaluations of the discussion provide information about their perceptions of the learning activity.

Assessment of student's learning. Overall, there was one striking finding--although the groups worked diligently, they did not produce cognitive explanations for the effectiveness of reciprocal teaching. Their explanations did not connect at all with the material from previous classes. They produced what I refer to as "person-on-the-street" answers (i.e., anybody could come up with the explanations without having been in the course or read the material). Actually, the class explained RT's effectiveness in terms of how it affects students' motivation (e.g., it involves students in small groups thus increasing their interest and engendering more self-responsibility for learning). They missed the cognitive perspective altogether.

In this instance, students invoked their own implicit theories about human behavior and ignored academic theory and research. The previous readings and class sessions did not influence their ideas. This happens frequently in psychology. People already have ideas about what accounts for behavior and they tend to rely on their own theories rather than integrate what's known formally from theory and research.

Assessment of students' perceptions of the learning experience. At the end of class I had students assess the quality and effectiveness of the discussions. Below are the results based upon the responses of 24 students who completed the form.

- How much did you:

learn from the discussion	A. a lot- 22	B. a little- 1	C. nothing- 0
participate in the discussion	A. a lot- 21	B. a little- 3	C. not at all- 0
enjoy the discussion	A. a lot- 24	B. a little- 0	C. not at all- 0

- Overall evaluation of the discussion as a learning experience
  A. excellent- 11 B. good-13 C. ave.-0 D. fair-0 E. poor-0

- How effective was the group in allocating time and getting work accomplished
  A. very- 22 B. somewhat-2 C. barely-0 D. not at all-0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Students reported a range of productive discussion behavior in their groups. The most prevalent counter-productive activities in the groups were monopolizing discussion, frequent irrelevant comments, changing the subject often, withdrawn or non-participating group members. There were 13 students who cited no counterproductive activity for their groups.

- Five students said that the groups would be more effective if everyone contributed to discussion, and four said that the groups needed to stay on task. Most students had no recommendations.

In summary, students did not achieve the specific learning goal I had in mind. They were unable to explain connections between teaching and learning from a cognitive perspective. On the other hand, they had a great time--they enjoyed and interpreted the class session as an effective learning experience.

What I learned, what I would do differently and why. This episode illustrates the difficulty that students have in applying abstract material to complex situations. There is a tendency for students to disregard academic theory and research in favor of accounts derived from personal experience. This highlights a very stubborn problem in teaching--how to get students to revise their knowledge and beliefs in light of new information that conflicts with prior beliefs. This is especially curious because students claim that one of the most important things they get from group learning is an opportunity to hear alternative perspectives from classmates. Students believe that the diversity of views helps them to extend and refine what they know. However, in this case the groups did not incorporate perspectives introduced through the readings.

There are two approaches I could take to improve their learning in this situation. One assumes that students' failure to use formal theory is due to the difficulty in applying abstract ideas to classroom situations. If this is the case then additional practice should help. I could plan one or two more class periods in which students practice the same activity (i.e., give them a teaching approach and have them explain how it affects learning and thinking). My role would be to intervene in the discussions and try to focus students on working with the cognitive perspective. I might also ask students to engage in different types of teaching/learning experiences and discuss the ways that these affect their own learning and thinking differently. It may be that students need to start by thinking about how teaching affects their own learning, and then work their way towards the abstract, general interpretations later. A second approach assumes that students' prior beliefs interfere with new learning. The cognitive perspective is foreign to students and perhaps given their belief in the motivational aspects of group learning, an unnecessary point of view. If this is the case then I need to create better examples for use in the classroom--examples that highlight the limitations of their prior theories.

There are a couple of ways to tinker with the activity itself. It might help to define the task more specifically. For example, instead of asking the class to "explain how RT affects students' learning" I might ask them to explain "how and why one aspect of RT (i.e., such as summarizing material) affects students' comprehension." I might participate more actively in the small group discussions, and try to give specific help and feedback on a group by group basis. I might also model a cognitive explanation before asking the class to do it.

As a result of analyzing this activity I realize that I need to establish a better foundation to help students bridge the gap between learning theories and teaching practices. This event also reinforces my belief that the course should be more "problem-based." Since my goal is to get students to be able to use the material to analyze, evaluate, solve and resolve problems, they should work regularly on complex, authentic kinds of teaching and learning problems where they practice applying theory and research to actual situations.

I am pleased by the positive evaluation of the group discussion. I am not bothered that they had a good time getting the "wrong answers." One overarching goal for the course is to promote a critical community--a setting in which students challenge and support one anothers' learning. The evidence suggests that this is happening, although the specific challenges within groups did not lead to the the kind of outcome I had intended. I believe that students did experience productive discussions and that my assessment of their learning does not reflect the full measure of what students did get out of the class session. Consequently, I might need to ask students on the discussion evaluation form to indicate the most important things they learned in the discussion. 370ASSESSGPLRN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

The Institution

Located in Kalamazoo, Western Michigan University (WMU) serves approximately 28,000 students seeking degrees in liberal arts, teacher education, and professional areas.

Background

Graduate students in English — many of them in the M.F.A. program — teach all sections of freshman composition each semester. Three years ago, the department began using teaching portfolios with these teaching associates (TAs) in order to provide a level of supervision and assistance that was not previously possible.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

All teaching associates compile a teaching portfolio. They start work on it during a required five-day TA-training workshop, then continue to develop and discuss their portfolios during a semester-long, three-hour seminar on the teaching of writing. Portfolio development is highly collaborative, and TAs have constant access to one another's portfolios (which are kept in the English Department) so that they can examine, comment on, and learn from them. Teaching portfolios have become an important vehicle through which TAs share information about courses and teaching. They also are the occasion for conferences with the TA supervisor, who has become much more of a mentor as a result of the use of portfolios.

Portfolio Design and Contents

Guidelines for portfolios are flexible, but call for evidence of several different aspects of reflective practice: (1) items that show a grasp of course content, e.g., lesson plans, handouts, quizzes, exams; (2) items that demonstrate teaching competence and student learning, e.g., student papers, student logs, peer observations; and (3) personal observations and reflections, e.g., notes and comments from conferences with the TA supervisor, plans for the future. In addition, all portfolios must include a personal reflective statement (see attached), which is written in several stages and discussed in the TA seminar. At the end of the semester, this statement is revised in light of the "picture" presented in the portfolio.

Evaluation of Portfolios

Teaching portfolios are evaluated according to three criteria: (1) the clear articulation of goals for the course and the particular students being taught; (2) the skill and imagination with which the TA achieves those goals; and (3) the extent to which the TA's goals and strategies fit departmental expectations and reflect current thinking about the teaching of composition. Discrepancy among these three areas is a red flag; consistency is sought.

Impact

The use of teaching portfolios has altered the role of the TA supervisor, who is now much more of a mentor. The portfolio functions as a "third party" in the TA/supervisor relationship, diffusing conflict and allowing for more useful negotiation. For TAs themselves, the portfolio

can provide them with powerful evidence of teaching effectiveness they can use when they enter the job market.

Materials Attached or Available

- Guidelines for TA as they develop their teaching portfolio, and an account of an exercise aimed at helping TAs compose their personal statement about their teaching, are attached.

Contact: Norma Van Rheenen
Professor of English
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5092

TEACHING PORTFOLIO

Your main project this semester is to compile a teaching portfolio documenting your particular strengths as a composition instructor. The portfolio should be suitable for use in obtaining a teaching position or applying for recognition of your teaching abilities within a department.

In designing the portfolio, you should consider commonly accepted standards of educational practice and course design, but also present materials that define your individuality as a teacher. Each section of the portfolio will open with a short statement from you, followed by concrete documentation from the course you have taught. Include a list of materials appended to each section.

I. Goals and Methods

Statement discussing how you designed the course to meet departmental and personal goals

Documentation: Course description
Assignment sheets

II. Strengths as a Teacher

Statement discussing what you see as your particular strengths in managing a classroom, promoting learning, interacting with students.

Documentation: Sample lesson plans or descriptions of class activities
Sample handouts
Graded papers
Products of teaching
Student comments (from evaluations, journals)
Peer observation report
Statement from Coordinator
Analysis of one student's progress

III. Self-improvement

Statement discussing efforts to improve your own teaching and/or writing skills.

Documentation: Essays written in response to assignments
Reading/reports/reviews
Reflective journals

IV. Goals for improvement

Statement discussing immediate plans for change in course design or teaching effectiveness.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Exercises to Help TAs Compose Personal Statement

TAs develop their initial personal statement about teaching in a series of values clarification exercises during the TA Training Workshop. On the first day, for example, we begin several activities involving metaphorical thinking. As individuals, TAs are asked to come up with a metaphor to express what teachers do. Certain comparisons recur every year--teachers as doctors, teachers as gardeners, teachers as coaches--but there are also the unusual ones--teachers as sheepherders, teachers as drill sergeants, teachers as striptease artists. There is much merriment as we recognize teaching styles we have encountered and as we appreciate the cleverness of people we are just getting to know. If the metaphors look at teaching primarily from the teacher's point of view, we sometimes repeat the exercise from the student's viewpoint, which never fails to elicit more hilarious memories.

The serious part of the exercise then begins, however, with small group work--sometimes in pairs, sometimes in threes--to look at the implications of each person's metaphor. We are especially interested in 1) the TA's view of the student, and 2) the view of what teaching is. At this point in their development, most TAs see the students as "defective," in need of "fixing," or as pliable material which can somehow be shaped to be like the teacher. The dominant view of teaching is often the "transmission" model, with knowledge moved from the teacher to the student.

A follow-up exercise asks the TAs to consider how they learned something. Half the people are asked to use a piece of academic knowledge as their primary example, and half consider nonacademic learning (riding a bike, for example). The resulting discussion raises more issues in the ongoing discussion of how people learn, as TAs question their earlier models. TAs are now ready to compose their initial statement about teaching. They are simply asked to write a short discussion (2-3 paragraphs) of what a teacher does.

Because teaching is highly discipline-specific, on the second day of the workshop we ask TAs to consider their learning experiences within the discipline they will teach--in our case, How did they learn to write? We are interested in finding out whether they view writing as an art or a craft.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

because their views in this matter may affect the way they teach. When we do values clarification exercises and examine underlying assumptions, most TAs are surprised to learn that many of them unconsciously view writing as something which cannot be taught ("you either have it, or you don't"). At the end of the day, they add to their statement a discussion of their specific beliefs about the teaching of writing.

The process continues throughout the week. TAs discuss what they most want to give students in their courses and discover they are often more interested in the students than in their writing. In journal writing and small group sharing they struggle to reconcile their conflicts. They consider personal needs that will be satisfied and/or challenged by teaching, and compare their needs to those of the students. They go through a process of justifying their discipline as they wrestle with questions about what writing and the teaching of writing can do for the particular students they will teach. They also consider which of their own personal needs will be satisfied and/or challenged by teaching, and compare their needs to those of the students. By the end of the week, the original statement on teaching is considerably expanded and revised. TAs are beginning to think about how their values and goals affect the way they will teach the course.

YORK UNIVERSITY

The Institution

York University has two campuses, both located in the Toronto, Canada, area. Some 46,000 students from around the world pursue a variety of degree programs in York's seven colleges.

Background

In Canada, the concept of the teaching portfolio (usually referred to as the "teaching dossier"), along with a guide for portfolio use, was developed by a committee of the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). In promoting portfolio development across campus, there is an attempt to increase the recognition and value of teaching in tenure and promotion considerations and in merit adjustments. There is also the hope that teaching portfolios will encourage faculty to become more reflective about their teaching, thereby generating more respect for and a better culture of teaching than currently exists.

Current Scope and Status of Portfolio Use

Portfolios are used primarily for promotion and tenure decisions. However, in 1992, they were introduced as evidence by the first two winners of a university-wide teaching award. Portfolios already have been used to support nominations for external teaching awards: for the Ontario Confederation of University Teachers teaching awards and for the 3M Teaching Fellowships (awarded to ten faculty members from across Canada each year, sponsored by 3M and the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education).

Use of portfolios is growing but not yet universal; however, that use cuts across the university. Portfolios have been compiled by faculty for two years and were included in about half of the tenure and promotion files reviewed this past year, including those for promotion to full professor.

The Centre for the Support of Teaching (CST), the main unit encouraging and promoting the use of portfolios, offers workshops and focus groups for interested faculty and teaching assistants. Individual consulting also is available on demand.

The motivation for portfolio development with full-time faculty is primarily tenure and promotion. For part-time faculty and teaching assistants, the motivation is to provide evidence of interest in teaching for job applications.

Portfolio Design and Contents

The Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning (SCOTL) elected to develop its own guide, *The Teaching Documentation Guide*, which is now given to all new faculty members at orientation. The typical teaching portfolio follows the headings and the format specified in that *Guide*. Contents include (1) descriptive materials, including names and titles of courses taught, number of students, teaching assistants, descriptions of curriculum development undertaken, outside teaching activities; (2) a statement of teaching philosophy; (3) results from student, peer, and departmental evaluations; and (4) documentation of any teaching awards, teaching methods, and innovative teaching developments.

Evaluation of Portfolios

There are really no guidelines for the evaluation of teaching dossiers, since they are still too new. At this point, an overall assessment of the dossier is made. Dossiers are particularly useful in promotion and tenure decisions because they can provide a context for assessing other data in the personnel file, particularly in difficult cases (e.g., a faculty member who uses controversial teaching techniques).

The SCOTL currently is developing a guide for the evaluation of teaching.

Obstacles to Portfolio Use and Solutions

There is a widely held view that teaching cannot be evaluated as easily as research. This, of course, creates an obstacle in the evaluation of teaching portfolios.

Impact

The effects of portfolio use are minimal at this point. Their use is now encouraged in the university academic plan, which is revised and updated each year.

Next Steps

The Teaching Documentation Guide currently is being reviewed in response to comments from tenure and promotion committees. Sample portfolios have been collected in the CST; these samples might later be incorporated into the *Guide*.

Another next step is portfolio assessment that is external to the relevant department, if not to the university. This seems to be a natural outcome of the more widespread use of teaching dossiers, and a growing area for portfolio development.

Advice for Other Campuses

Teaching portfolio workshops should be offered on a departmental basis. Department chairs are the key to widespread portfolio use. Encourage the notion of the dossier as a "sample of best work." Keep the size of the dossiers under control, since some of them tend to be far too long.

Contact: Pat Rogers
Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics and Faculty of Education, and Director, Centre for the Support of Teaching
York University
4700 Keele Street
North York, Ontario M3J 1P3
CANADA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anson, C.M. (Forthcoming). "The Teaching Portfolio: Writing Our Way to Reflective Practice." In *New Directions in Portfolio Assessment.* Edited by D.A. Daiker, L. Black, M. Morenberg, and J. Sommers. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann/Boynton-Cook.

Bird, T. (1989). "The Schoolteacher's Portfolio: An Essay on Possibilities." In *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation: Elementary and Secondary Personnel.* 2nd ed. Edited by J. Millman and L. Darling-Hammond, pp. 241-255. Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

Collins, A. (1991). "Portfolios for Biology Teacher Assessment." *Journal of School Personnel Evaluation in Education* 5(2):147-167.

Edgerton, R., P. Hutchings, and K. Quinlan. (1991). *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
See ordering information on page 122.

Hutchings, P.A. (1991). "The Teaching Portfolio." *The Department Chair* 2(1):33-35.

Millis, B.J. (1991). *Developing a Teaching Portfolio.* Unpublished materials assembled for the University of Maryland University College faculty.
Available from Barbara J. Millis, Assistant Dean, Faculty Development, University of Maryland University College, University Boulevard at Adelphi Road, College Park, MD 20742-1660.

_____. (1991). "Putting the Teaching Portfolio in Context." *To Improve the Academy* 10:215-232.

O'Neil, C., and A. Wright. (1992). *Recording Teaching Accomplishment.* Halifax, N.S.: Dalhousie University.
Order from Alan Wright, Executive Director, Office of Instructional Development and Technology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, B3H 3J5 CANADA; $6.00 each.

Seldin, P. (1991). *The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions.* Bolton, Mass.: Anker Publishing.
Order from Anker Publishing, 176 Ballville Road, P.O. Box 249, Bolton, MA 01740-0249; $14.95 each, plus $1.50 shipping/handling.

———— , and L. Annis. (1990). "The Teaching Portfolio." *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development* 8(4):197-201.

Shore, B.M., et al. (1986). *The Teaching Dossier: A Guide to Its Preparation and Use.* Rev. ed. Montreal: Canadian Association of University Teachers.

Shulman, L. (1991) "Dangerous Liaison: Connecting the Assessment of Faculty With the Assessment of Students." Keynote address, Sixth AAHE Conference on Assessment in Higher Education.

Order on audiotape from Mobiltape Company, Inc., 25061 W. Avenue Stanford, Suite 70, Valencia, CA 91355; $8.50 each, plus $4.00 shipping/handling.

Wolf, K. (1991). "The Schoolteacher's Portfolio: Practical Issues in Design, Implementation, and Evaluation." *Phi Delta Kappan* October, pp. 129-136.

Evaluating Professional Writing Instructors: A Charter

The Writing Program
Syracuse University
January, 1993

Co-Directors

Carol Lipson and Charles Watson

Members of The Teacher Evaluation Task Force

Peggy Bonesteel, PWI
Amanda Brown, PWI, Evaluation Facilitator
Steve Feikes, PWI
Anne Fitzsimmons, PWI, Co-chairperson
JoEllen Kwiatek, PWI, Co-chairperson
Faith Plvan, Assistant Director
Joy Rouse, Assistant Professor
Tom Townsley, PWI

FOREWORD

The process for teacher evaluation outlined in this document was developed in consultation with the Director of the Writing Program during the 1989-90 and 1990-91 academic years by a Task Force for Teacher Evaluation in the Syracuse University Writing Program. Like all documents in the Writing Program this one is best understood as heuristic, subject to interpretation, updating, and revision within the context of the Program's development in the College of Arts and Sciences and Syracuse University. It is for this reason that it is best understood as a "charter" for the periodic evaluation of Professional Writing Instructors in the Syracuse University Writing Program.

Charged by the Director with developing an evaluation process for the Writing Program's Professional Writing Instructors (PWIs), the Task Force set the following two-fold goal for its work: to propose a body of teacher evaluators and to design an evaluation process that would be sensitive to the different styles and talents of individual teachers, fair to all teachers, consonant with university policies, and responsive to the needs and goals of the Writing Program. As we worked to accomplish these goals, members of the Task Force were mindful that the criteria for evaluation which members of a teaching/learning community develop are statements of their values, even as the procedures for evaluation which members of a community practice are enactments of their values.

Guided by advice received from (1) instructors in the Writing Program, (2) experts in evaluation across Syracuse University, (3) teachers and administrators in the Writing Program and an earlier Freshman English Program who have have been responsible for the evaluation of teachers of composition at Syracuse in the past, and (4) professional evaluation literature, the Task Force and the Director of the Writing Program agreed upon the following process for teacher evaluation in the Writing Program.

THE PROCESS FOR EVALUATION

Each spring, teachers whose contracts expire at the close of that academic year will construct portfolios in which they represent their work in the Writing Program since their last evaluation. During the month of May, a Standing Teacher Evaluation Committee will evaluate the quality of teachers' work based upon their reading of teachers' portfolios. Working from the assessments of the Teacher Evaluation Committee and information known to them about the specific needs of the Writing Program and available teaching positions for the following year(s), an Administrative Advisory Group, appointed by the Director, will jointly formulate and forward to the Director merit, contract, workload, and hiring recommendations, along with all the information on which these recommendations are based. Finally, in accordance with the *Director's* contractual responsibility, *he or she* will make all final merit, contract, workload, and hiring decisions.

1992-1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TEACHER-CONSTRUCTED PORTFOLIOS

During the first stage of the process, teachers are asked to represent their teaching, *and if consultants their consulting,* in portfolios that will provide evaluators three perspectives on each instructor's work in the Writing Program: the instructor's perspective, the instructor's students' perspectives, and the instructor's colleagues' perspectives.

To insure the reliability and validity of this evaluation process, that is, to insure that these portfolios will be read consistently from teacher to teacher and that they will be read with appropriate appreciation for the diverse range of courses and teaching practices that the studio curriculum invites, instructors are asked to include in portfolios the following items, each of which instructors may shape in the manner they believe will best represent their individual teaching. *(Note: Although PWIs are asked to include these items for the year their contracts expire, instructors who are preparing portfolios to represent multiple years of teaching may either focus on just the last year or provide a sampling of these items from across the years of teaching that they are representing.)*

• **A Preface:** *Instructors on multiple-year contracts are required to supply a preface to guide evaluators in the reading of their portfolios; other instructors are not expected to compose a preface, but may, perhaps to highlight the significance of a certain component for readers or to request specific feedback on certain issues.*

• **A Reflective Statement:** *Teachers are asked to reflect on their teaching in a 3-5 page reflective statement. This is an opportunity to flesh out a particular topic or draw together professional work in the Writing Program in a single discussion. Possible topics include the use of conferences, the strategies for class discussion, the management of authority, the use of peer groups, or other topics having to do with teaching broadly conceived.*

• **Class Materials:** *Instructors are asked to include a syllabus for each of the courses they taught during the contract period and a total of three teacher-constructed hand-outs (assignments, correspondences, peer group response sheets, etc.). In addition, they are asked to include a design overview from the most recent year. They may add a second if they choose from any time within the contract period.*

• **Classroom Observation:** Instructors in the Writing Program *are asked to* have their teaching observed by one among the following of their colleagues: any PWI who is currently or has been a coordinator in the program, any salaried (three-quarter-time) instructor, or any instructor in the fourth merit tier. Individuals serving on the Teacher Evaluation Committee, even though they may be members of one of these groups, will not do classroom observations while they serve on the committee. Neither will Coordinators observe an instructor who is a member of his or her current coordinating group.

Observations will include a pre-observation conference between the instructor and the observer, a classroom observation, a post-observation conference, and a written account of the class visit composed by the observer. Each instructor is invited to compose a response to the written observation if he or she chooses.

1992-1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

• **Student Evaluations and Cover Notes:** *Instructors will use the standard forms for student evaluations that have been developed by the Teacher Evaluation Committee and the Syracuse University Center for Instructional Development. Student evaluations from each section taught will automatically be a part of the teachers' portfolios. Teachers have the option of composing cover notes stating their own reactions to the student evaluations, but these notes are optional and limited to one page per semester. These notes are not customarily expected, but may be included to contextualize the evaluations for readers if the teacher feels that they are needed.*

• **Student Work:** *Instructors are asked to select representations of student writing to include in their portfolios; this would include no more than one assignment and 1 or 2 student papers which have teacher commentary The student papers may be from 1-10 pages. Instructors are asked to include a rationale of no more than one page explaining what the assignment and papers are meant to show about their teaching. Teachers might want to include intermediate drafts with comments or only final papers; they might want to include papers which illustrate key problems in a writing project or achievements of success. It depends on the particular rationale for the inclusion. Teachers should take care that their commentary on xeroxed copies is readable. It is understood that the nature of the commentary may vary from stage to stage in the writing process and from teaching context to teaching context.*

• **Consultant work:** *Consultants representing their work are asked to do so either in a portion of the Reflective Statement or in the inclusions under the Student Work component. If consultants do not find means within these components adequate or appropriate for representing their consulting, they may choose to include a letter from a student or a teacher with whom they have worked over time, student evaluations, or a tape or video.*

• **Optional Items:** When instructors wish to do so, they are welcome to include in their portfolios other items that may provide evaluators a picture of some significant aspect of their professional work that required portfolio items do not furnish. Among the items we can imagine instructors choosing to include are those listed below.

- Articles
- Case studies
- Conference presentations
- Letters of recommendation
- Merit awards
- Curriculum Vitae
- Related professional or intellectual work

Please note that instructors are asked not to include optional items in their portfolios unless those items provide a picture of some significant aspect of their professional work that is not revealed in the required portfolio items. Because there is limited time to review each portfolio, it is important that instructors provide portfolio evaluators focused, selected presentations of their work. *Teachers' inclusion of optional items is strictly limited to those that will represent a picture of some significant aspect of their teaching that is not included in the portfolio items.*

1992-1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE TEACHER EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Constitution of the Committee

The Teacher Evaluation Committee will be composed of eight members. Five of these will be PWIs--four elected to the committee by a vote of their peers, one appointed to the committee by the Director. The three others will be appointed by the Director from among full-time faculty members, administrative staff members, and PWIs. (For example, in a given year the committee may be composed of four elected PWIs, a faculty member with administrative responsibilities in the Program, a staff member with teaching responsibilities in the the Program, and two PWIs appointed by the Director.) To be eligible for service on the Teacher Evaluation Committee, a PWI must have at least two years' experience in the Writing Program and experience teaching at least two different studio writing courses. Each year, two eligible PWIs will be elected to serve on the committee for one-year renewable terms that will normally be renewed for a second year. (The terms PWIs will serve on the Teacher Evaluation Committee are described as they are here in order to accommodate, for example, the election to the committee of a PWI who may be in the last year of a multiple-year contract, a PWI who will likely serve on the committee for two years but who would not be eligible to do so technically.) The Director will make annual appointments to the committee after consulting with the previous year's Teacher Evaluation Committee. In appointments to the committee, the Director will be working to insure that all aspects of the Writing Program's teaching are represented in the body charged with evaluating that teaching. For example, if in a given year no member of the committee has experience in teaching WRT 405, the Director may choose to appoint a member to the committee who has experience teaching that course.

Elections and appointments to the Teacher Evaluation Committee will take place between October 15 and October 31 each academic year. It is expected that PWIs who serve on the Teacher Evaluation Committee will be compensated for their work with one discretionary section during each academic year they serve on the committee. Members will read and evaluate portfolios after the close of spring semester.

The Chair of the Teacher Evaluation Committee, who will be elected by the committee, will be a PWI in the Writing Program and will serve on the Administrative Advisory Group.

Work of the Committee:

• **Criterion-referenced, holistic evaluation:** During the second stage of the evaluation process, members of the Teacher Evaluation Committee will conduct a criterion-referenced, holistic assessment of portfolios of PWIs and of TAs applying for PWI status. Members of the Teacher Evaluation Committee will not read each component in each portfolio as if it were separate and discrete from the whole. *Evaluators read each component of the portfolio in the context of the rest of the portfolio, and read entire portfolios in relation to one another.*

Although portfolio readers will read and evaluate the teaching represented in instructors' portfolios holistically, they will not do so impressionistically. With reference to criteria shaped as a set of questions, portfolio evaluators will read *across* the items instructors include in their portfolios for the purpose of shaping a

holistic picture of instructors' professional work. The criteria that will guide portfolio evaluators' readings are expressions of values for teaching in the Writing Program as those values are presented and discussed in numerous program documents and as they are constantly undergoing development and refinement through the conversations and experiments of program members. Because these criteria for evaluation are statements of local and dynamic values, they will be reviewed and published annually. The current set of criteria shaped as questions are attached to this charter as Addendum A.

• **Procedure for evaluation:** Again, because the conduct of assessment readings is subject to annual review, a description of the current practice for reading and rating instructors' portfolios is attached to this charter as Addendum B.

• **Reporting on evaluations:** Portfolio readers' responses to the criteria for evaluation of instructors' work, developed from their holistic readings of instructors' portfolios, will lead them to award the teaching represented in each instructor's portfolio one of six ratings: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, on a scale in which 1 represents outstanding teaching and 6 represents inadequate teaching. These ratings will serve as the basis for conferences instructors may wish to schedule to discuss their portfolios and/or their evaluations with either the faculty or staff administrator who has served on the Teacher Evaluation Committee.

Based upon its evaluations, the Teacher Evaluation Committee may choose to recommend instructors for merit or for particular roles in the Writing Program.

In addition to the values and reporting process articulated above, items (1) and (2) below address the handling of sensitive and confidential information.

(1) Handling of sensitive information: From time to time, sensitive information must be brought to the attention of the Teacher Evaluation Committee and factored into the evaluation of instructors. Such information, although not typically included by teachers in their portfolios, does figure in a portrait of their teaching. For example, occasionally students complain through formal channels about the instruction they are receiving, about the failure of an instructor to return papers they have submitted, or about the failure of an instructor to meet classes. As a first step, the individual who receives these complaints passes them along to the instructor with offers for support to the instructor in addressing them should the instructor desire such support. If complaints persist, a Writing Program administrator will meet with the instructor to devise a strategy for handling the complaints and the problem(s) which are leading to them. In unusual cases, however, when complaints persist further, an administrator in the Writing Program will discuss them with the instructor and formally document the substance of those discussions in writing for the instructor and for Writing Program records.

It would be neither fair nor ethical for an instructional unit such as the Writing Program to act as if serious questions about instructors' teaching have not been raised when, in fact, they have. This unit has a professional and moral obligation to inform instructors when their professional work is being called into question. It also has a professional and moral obligation to provide students competent instruction, and to effect changes if students are not receiving the instruction this university promises them. Before any information about an instructor is formally recorded, however, the instructor will be notified of that information. When information about an instructor has been noted, that instructor will have a copy of that notation.

1992-1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(2) Handling of confidential information: From time to time, an instructor experiences some trauma that has an impact on his or her entire life, including his or her professional life. It is not unusual in such a case for the individual to want this situation to remain private, confidential. For example, an instructor may contract and be struggling with a serious illness that affects his or her ability to meet classes regularly or to concentrate on professional work. While such a situation will obviously affect an instructor's teaching, it will not be shared with the Teacher Evaluation Committee. The Director is responsible for handling confidential information in such a way as to protect instructors' privacy.

Sensitive information will be treated as confidential information within the evaluation process.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISORY GROUP

Following their reading of portfolios, the Teacher Evaluation Committee will forward to the Director the evaluations they have awarded each portfolio. The Director will then call together an Administrative Advisory Group composed of (1) members of the Writing Program faculty and (2) members of the Writing Program's administrative staff with appointments that bear on evaluation, professional development, and hiring. This group will include such people as faculty members with administrative responsibilities and staff members with administrative responsibilities. In addition, the Chair and the administrative staff member(s) of the Teacher Evaluation Committee will serve as members of the Administrative Advisory Group.

Working from the evaluations formed by the Teacher Evaluation Committee as well as information known to them about the specific needs of the Writing Program and available teaching positions for the following year(s), the Administrative Advisory Group will jointly formulate and forward to the Director merit, contract, workload, and hiring recommendations, along with all the information on which these recommendations are based. In making their own judgments, the Administrative Advisory Group may consult with representatives of the Teacher Evaluation Committee as well as independently review the information on which the Committee's evaluations were based. If the Administrative Advisory Group's recommendations reflect differences in judgment from those of the Teacher Evaluation Committee, those differences will be noted for the attention of the Director.

TEACHER-INITIATED EVALUATIONS

Normally, the work of PWIs in the Writing Program will be evaluated in any given academic year only if those PWIs' contracts expire at the close of that academic year. Occasionally, however, PWIs may wish to initiate evaluation of their work for one of several possible reasons. For example, they are in the middle of a multi-year contract but eligible to advance to the next merit tier on the basis of seniority; they wish to be considered for early advancement within the merit tier system; they wish to apply for salaried (three-quarter-time or full-time) instructorships as these become available.

In such cases, PWIs initiating evaluations will develop portfolios representing their work in which they include a classroom observation done by a member of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teacher Evaluation Committee. Based upon the portfolios they have constructed, PWIs initiating evaluations will present their work to a panel composed of a faculty member with administrative responsibilities, a staff member with teaching responsibilities, the Chair of the Teacher Evaluation Committee (or another TEC representative if the Chair has initiated an evaluation), and a PWI chosen from among teachers in the program who are three-quarter-time instructors, coordinators, or instructors in the fourth merit tier.

When presenting their work to an Evaluation Panel, PWIs are asked to place their current portfolios in the context of their previous ones, to demonstrate the direction their work in the Writing Program has taken, and to suggest why and how it may be considered meritorious. As they present their work to an Evaluation Panel, instructors initiating evaluation not only will have the opportunity to bring before the panel aspects of their work that may not lend themselves to representation in writing (e.g., a computer program), but they will extend the knowledge base within the Program as they present the insights they have gleaned from their work--their research--to others for review. In this review process, just as other professional practitioners present their work for juried review, PWIs initiating evaluations in the Writing Program will present their work for review by colleagues recognized as expert teachers of writing.

THE PROCEDURE FOR MERIT, CONTRACT, HIRING DECISIONS

The Director is contractually responsible for all final merit, contract, workload, and hiring decisions. As the Director reviews the materials forwarded from the Teacher Evaluation Committee, the Administrative Advisory Group, and the Teacher Evaluation Panel; in the process of making decisions, he or she may choose to consult with members of any of these groups. Each year the Director will make a report to the Teacher Evaluation Committee, the Administrative Advisory Group, and the various Evaluation Panels on the evaluation process, bearing in mind issues of sensitivity and confidentiality. This report and its discussion by these groups in the fall will serve as the basis for refining the teacher evaluation process and also for establishing appropriate mentoring relationships for instructors during that academic year.

- **Right to Know:** Full disclosure of the rationale for teacher evaluations is available to teachers. Instructors who wish to know how they were evaluated, and why, may make an appointment with the faculty or staff director with responsibilities for evaluation to learn that information.

- **A Process for Review:** Any instructor who is dissatisfied with his or her evaluation may initiate an internal review process by writing a letter explaining the reason for her/his dissatisfaction to the Director. The Director, a representative of the Administrative Advisory Group, and a representative of the Teacher Evaluation Committee will review the case and schedule a meeting with the instructor to share their findings.

ADDENDUM A

The Criteria for Evaluation of Teacher Constructed Portfolios (1992-93)

1. Is this teacher's course an appropriate interpretation of the specific studio level and the studio curriculum?

2. Has this teacher fostered inquiry-based learning comprehensively through course rationale and classroom practices?

3. Has this teacher taught rhetorical skills appropriate to the studio level?

4. Has this teacher chosen texts and approaches to reading that challenge students' critical reading skills?

5. Has this teacher connected reading to writing projects in order to promote successful student writing?

6. Has this teacher addressed the connections between writing and audience that will help prepare students to meet the varied expectations for writing in settings outside of the studio curriculum?

7. Has this teacher both challenged and supported students to reflect on their own learning processes in the studio?

8. Has this teacher encouraged collaborative learning?

9. Has this teacher clearly communicated his or her goals and expectations for coursework to students?

10. Has this teacher taught the writing process within each project, planning for such things as drafts, revisions, copy editing etc.?

11. Has this teacher planned for a sequence of writing assignments? Are the writing assignments designed with consideration of their intellectual relationship to one another within the course?

12. Has this teacher demonstrated his or her responsiveness and sensitivity to individual students' ideas and their growth and development as learners?

13. Has this teacher met the program's expectation to grow professionally and to reflect on that growth?

1992-1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ADDENDUM B

Procedure for Reading and Evaluating Instructors' Portfolios (1990-91)

The eight members of the Teacher Evaluation Committee (TEC) will begin their evaluative readings by dividing themselves into two sub-groups of four each. In order to prepare themselves to read reliably (to read as consistently as possible from one portfolio to another), members of the committee will read together eight portfolios selected at random. Each group will begin by reading four portfolios in common. Each reader in each group will evaluate each of the four portfolios; then group members will discuss the portfolios and their readings/evaluations. Discussions undertaken by these readers will be exceedingly full and painstaking as readers assess portfolios read in light of the criteria for evaluation and as they begin to see portfolios in relationship to one another.

Following these initial readings designed to enable readers to invest ranking categories with meaning and value, members of each group will read two portfolios that the other group has read in order that the eight readers will have read four portfolios in common. Following this reading, reader/evaluators will meet together and discuss at length these portfolios, the criteria, and the meaning and values with which they are investing the rating categories. At this time, all members of the committee working together will rate the eight portfolios and allow those portfolios to stand as reference points for their subsequent readings.

After this "norming" process, the following procedure will be put in place for the remainder of the readings. A cover sheet will be attached to each instructor's portfolio, and portfolios will be arranged randomly in one setting. Readers will come to this setting, select the first portfolio in the arrangement, sign their names to the cover sheet, read and tentatively rate the portfolio. When the first evaluator finishes, he or she will replace the portfolio on the top of the arrangement so that the next available reader will select it. When three evaluators have read and tentatively rated the portfolio, the last evaluator will convene the others to discuss the portfolio and their tentative ratings of it and to reach consensus on the rating they will assign the portfolio.

The reasons for this procedure are multiple. (1) It provides for extensive "norming" at the outset. (2) It insures that "cliques" of readers will not form, that readers will constantly read with different colleagues and, therefore, constantly have to explain their judgments to one another. (3) It insures that individual readers will not read for too long or make too many judgments without the benefit of talk, without the benefit of re-"norming." (4) It works to prevent fatigue and the inadequate readings that can and do result from fatigue. (5) By insuring that one reader will not read portfolios in the same order as another, it works to counteract "environmental readings," that is, readings that are affected by previous readings (e.g., if an evaluator reads an outstanding portfolio and then reads a strong one, perhaps by comparison the second will appear only sound; whereas, if the reader has read the portfolio in question directly after reading an inadequate one, perhaps the portfolio will appear to be outstanding.)

When all readings are completed, all discussions held, evaluations decided, and rest time has passed, the committee will reconvene to reconsider its work holistically. It will make such adjustments in ratings as it deems necessary from the perspective of having before the committee the whole picture which was not possible previously.

1992-1993

Louise Wetherbee Phelps April 1992

WRITING PROGRAM DRAFT EVALUATION PLAN: ANNUAL MERIT SALARY REVIEW FOR FULL-TIME FACULTY

POLICIES AND CRITERIA FOR FACULTY PERFORMANCE

The attached Writing Program Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, approved in 1990, fully set forth criteria for performance and achievement as they bear on promotion and tenure decisions for full-time faculty. The same policies apply in conducting annual merit salary reviews. The Program is continuing to refine its procedures for implementing these policies in reviews for salary decisions, promotion and tenure, and related mentorship processes.

Briefly, the Writing Program evaluates faculty performance in four rather than three categories of effort and contribution: **teaching, scholarship, administration**, and **professional activities and services**. Each of these categories is redefined more broadly than is traditional. Performance in these categories is evaluated on two dimensions of achievement: **significant intellectual work*** and **academic and professional citizenship**. In consonance with the criteria for promotion and tenure, in annual merit salary reviews distinguished accomplishment or promise in intellectual work carries primary weight. However, contributions as a citizen of academic and professional communities are also highly valued, especially in conjunction with intellectual work.

The policies of the Writing Program in evaluating intellectual work provide for faculty members to **balance and/or integrate** efforts differently within the categories, and **strongly emphasize and value teaching as a form of scholarship**. The Guidelines state: ". . . significant intellectual and creative contributions may occur in any arena of faculty activity: scholarship, education, administration, professional activities and services of varied types. Often intellectual work by faculty in the Writing Program is integrated across these categories. . . The quality and significant impact of the intellectual work is more important than its label. Candidates for tenure and promotion will differ legitimately in how they balance effort and achievement among these categories." In the context of criteria for promotion, the Guidelines state: "Candidates for promotion to associate professor may present a balanced and integrated picture of their scholarship, teaching, administration, and professional activities and service, or they may claim either scholarship or teaching as a primary area for their intellectual work. In both cases they will be expected to demonstrate substantive accomplishments and the promise of intellectual excellence in either scholarship or teaching, and strength of intellectual contributions in at least one of the other three categories. All candidates in the Writing Program are expected to show more than adequate accomplishment in teaching and its extensions (curriculum development, program leadership, mentoring, etc.)"

In addition, the Guidelines take into consideration differences between "local" contributions (to the program, college, or university) and "cosmopolitan" contributions (to the profession at large), recognizing that "faculty members with a local emphasis tend to make their greatest contributions in teaching," and that "the impact of achievement in teaching and curricular work is more indirect and gradual. . . This kind of intellectual work may be

---

* "Intellectual work" here is equivalent to what the Chancellor calls an "expanded definition of research," including the "scholarship" of discovery, integration, application, and teaching.

harder to demonstrate or evaluate, and is appreciated and nationally recognized only over a period of time. It is nonetheless valuable to the university and the society."

PROCEDURES

These policies require that the Writing Program develop a procedure by which faculty members can present and document work within the four categories of effort and can account for balances and integrations among them. It is most efficient to use one portfolio system for doing so, since otherwise, particularly in the case of faculty whose work is highly integrated, there would be many redundancies between, say, a teaching portfolio and a record of scholarly publications and presentations. Also, the portfolio must focus on intellectual work, but also include contributions as an academic and professional citizen.

The Integrated Portfolio of Intellectual Work and Citizenship

Each faculty member will prepare a portfolio for yearly review and mentorship purposes that is envisioned to include the following elements and sections.

1. a brief **introduction or gloss**, which explains the balance and/or integration each faculty member has chosen for this year, as it fits into a career emphasis that may change from year to year, but should show a pattern of productivity and development. This gloss will point to connections between different parts of the portfolio and discuss distribution of effort and strengths. It should as much as possible place the current year's work within a career perspective. Senior faculty will be asked to provide a selective focus in their reflections and accounts that will help to limit the amount of material to be reviewed.

2. an updated **curriculum vitae**

3. a **section on teaching** (in the expanded sense) **and leadership**, including:

   a. an annual **activities list for teaching and related administrative leadership**, including courses taught, advising, curricular projects, writing across the curriculum projects, faculty development efforts, administrative coordination or direction of teaching, etc.
   b. a **reflection on teaching activities** that year, incorporating a selective account of the most important and comments on impact or effectiveness
   c. **documentation** of performance in teaching/leadership [see note below on possible inclusions]

4. a section on **scholarship and dissemination**, including:

   a. an **annual activities list** for scholarship, including publications, acceptances, invitations, presentations, and work in progress
   b. a **reflection on scholarly activities** that year, incorporating a selective account of the most important and comments on dissemination (forum and audience, recognition, impact, etc.)

   c. **documentation of scholarship**, e.g., selected mss. or published work, , letters from publishers, etc.

5. an **activity list and statement on academic and professional citizenship,** including professional activities and services not already accounted for and pointing out connections with intellectual work in the various categories

6. FOR IN-HOUSE MENTORING PURPOSES ONLY: **a statement of future goals and plans** along with problems, questions, or advice requested of faculty colleagues

Documentation of teaching will include some required elements, including course or teacher evaluations by students, and a variety of options. It will be necessary for faculty to be selective in order to make reviews manageable. Possible inclusions include written teaching materials like syllabi, assignments, student papers and teacher responses, or teaching logs; peer review of teaching materials; class observations; videos of classes or conferences; teaching material or interactions with students on disk; responses to student evaluations; and letters from students, co-teachers, or others. The Writing Program has extensive experience in teaching portfolios that will inform our decisions about requirements, options, and ways of focusing and limiting the bulk of material. All undergraduate courses (studios) in the Writing Program are regularly evaluated by students, as is the 613 practicum and internship program.

It is expected that the annual portfolios will be a primary document for annual untenured faculty review and a model and source for all faculty to construct cumulative, summative portfolios for reappointment and for promotion and tenure. The portfolio represents, however, the faculty member's own perspective, and does not replace other sources of information and evidence, including their own observations, on which peers and administrators make their assessments of faculty performance.

<u>Other New Measures for Improving and Evaluating Teaching</u>

1. We will develop a new **committee mentoring system** that will gather and report information to the chair/director for the annual departmental review of untenured faculty as well as providing mentorship for such faculty. A three-person committee, including one senior faculty member from the second department of joint appointment (presently, English), will be appointed for each new junior faculty member. This committee will carry out the annual review, based in part on the integrated portfolio, and provide a report to the director/chair. There will be rotation of at least some members from year to year.

2. The program will plan a **Junior Faculty Mentoring Day** each spring, in which time will be set aside for informal, collegial discussions of each faculty member's work, and each will meet privately as well with the three-person committee for assessment and advice.

   There are already many opportunities for faculty to receive feedback on their classroom teaching, to attend program conferences on teaching, and to hear outside and campus speakers on teaching issues. For this reason the public discussions among all faculty on Mentoring Day will focus on scholarship, especially work in progress, and professional activities.

3. The Writing Program intends to develop a comprehensive plan for **graduate teaching assessment** that is not primarily based on assessments of the success of individual classes, but addresses both the graduate teacher and the graduate curriculum. This plan will probably begin by focusing on students in the graduate minor/concentration in

Composition and Cultural Rhetoric. As we currently envision it, graduate students will be asked yearly to evaluate their experience in the graduate program that year, as follows:

-- to assess each **graduate teacher** in the Writing Program with whom they have worked that year, either in courses or in other settings such as dossier committees or informal advising relationships, in terms of contribution to their own learning and professional development
-- to assess each **course** taken from Writing Program faculty that year as a contribution to their own program of study
[this question will be asked of each graduate student taking a Writing Program faculty member's graduate course, including those not enrolled in the minor/concentration]
-- to assess the **graduate curriculum** [at this point, for the CCR minor/concentration] in terms of coherence, availability and frequency of courses, organization and requirements, etc. , with attention to each course taken that year as a component of the curriculum
-- to assess the Writing Program as a **graduate teaching community** for its support of graduate students' professional development, e.g., through workshops on conference proposals, the teaching associate program, preparation for qualifying exams or job interviews, etc.
-- to make **proposals for improvement** in the curriculum or support of graduate students' needs

ABOUT AAHE

The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) is a national organization of individuals dedicated to improving the quality of higher education. AAHE members share two convictions: that higher education should play a more central role in national life, and that each of our institutions can be more effective. AAHE helps to translate these convictions into action. Through its programmatic activities, its conferences, and its publications, AAHE helps its members acquire the "big picture" and the practical tools they need to increase their effectiveness in their own setting and to improve the enterprise as a whole.

Member support enables AAHE to initiate projects — such as the AAHE Teaching Initiative and the AAHE Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards — on a range of issues to create effective change at the campus, state, and national levels. Members receive discounts to the conferences and publications these projects generate and they can access the projects' consulting, networking, and information resources.

Other benefits of AAHE membership include subscriptions to *Change* magazine and the *AAHE Bulletin*; discounts on conference registrations; discounts on selected non-AAHE periodicals *(The Journal of Higher Education* and *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports)*; and more. For more information about AAHE membership and activities, contact AAHE at One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110; phone 202/293-6440, fax 202/293-0073.

The AAHE Teaching Initiative

In April 1990, AAHE announced that a generous gift from Allen Jossey-Bass enabled it to launch a new program within AAHE called The Teaching Initiative. AAHE's Teaching Initiative is best understood not as an attempt to promote any particular teaching strategy or method but as work on a number of fronts to help promote a campus culture in which questions about teaching and learning are topics of ongoing, public faculty discourse.

The AAHE Teaching Initiative currently consists of these activities:

Cases About College Teaching and Learning The first major project of the AAHE Teaching Initiative was a three-year effort begun in 1990 to develop cases about college teaching and learning. These cases, focused on introductory courses in a variety of disciplines, are intended to prompt more context-specific (and therefore, we think, more authentic) conversations among faculty about how to work successfully with students.

Turning TAs Into Teachers In 1991, for the third time, AAHE cosponsored with several other associations the *National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants*. The conferences are held biennially; the next is scheduled for 1993.

The Forum on Exemplary Teaching More than a hundred faculty, identified on their campuses as exemplary teachers and as "teachers of teachers," meet during AAHE's annual National Conference on Higher Education for a special program. The Forum on Exemplary Teaching — which began in 1989 — aims to develop and promote richer ways to represent and inquire into teaching and learning. Faculty delegates to the Forum serve as liaisons between their campuses and the AAHE Teaching Initiative.

Teaching Portfolios If cases can help us understand teaching, the teaching portfolio can help document the ways we put that understanding into practice. A growing number of campuses are turning to this promising new vehicle for the evaluation and improvement of teaching. AAHE has been studying uses of the teaching portfolio for several years, and a monograph is now available. The Teaching Initiative also is establishing a "user network."

AAHE Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards

The Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards focuses on the redefinition of faculty priorities and institutional expectations for faculty in the context of a rapidly changing academic workplace. The Forum sponsors an annual conference and publications on issues of faculty evaluation, with special emphasis on peer review of professional service and scholarship.

Other AAHE Publications on Teaching

The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching (1991, 72pp)
By Russell Edgerton, Pat Hutchings, and Kathleen Quinlan.
AAHE members: $10.95 each, nonmembers $12.95 each, for 1-7 copies.
Bulk orders: 8-19 copies, $8.95 each; 20+ copies, $7.50 each.

Cases About College Teaching and Learning: Toward a More Reflective Practice (1993, 80pp)
By Pat Hutchings.
AAHE members: $15.00 each, nonmembers $17.00 each. Bulk discounts available.

The Case for Cases in Teacher Education (1991, 36pp)
By Katherine K. Merseth. Copublished by AAHE and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
IMPORTANT: Send check payable to "AACTE Publications" directly to AACTE, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-2412.
AAHE and AACTE members: $12.00 each, nonmembers $14.00 each.

Preparing Graduate Students to Teach: A Guide to Programs That Improve Undergraduate Education and Develop Tomorrow's Faculty (1992, 150pp)
Edited by Leo M. Lambert and Stacey Lane Tice.
AAHE members: $20.00 each, nonmembers $22.00 each. Bulk discounts available.

Orders under $50 must be accompanied by check or charge payment; orders over $50 must be accompanied by payment or institutional purchase order. Order from AAHE Publications, Box PD, One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036-1110; ph. 202/293-6440, fax 202/293-0073. Make checks payable to "AAHE Publications."

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
ph 202/293-6440 fax 202/293-0073